arXiv:1205.4191v1 [math.RT] 18 May 2012

Finite-dimensional representations of twisted hyper loop algebras.☆

Angelo Bianchi and Adriano Moura

Universidade Estadual de Campinas

Abstract

We investigate the category of finite-dimensional representations of twisted hyper loop algebras, i.e., the hyperalgebras associated to twisted loop algebras over finite-dimensional simple Lie algebras. The main results are the classification of the irreducible modules, the definition of the universal highest-weight modules, called the Weyl modules, and, under a certain mild restriction on the characteristic of the ground field, a proof that the simple modules and the Weyl modules for the twisted hyper loop algebras are isomorphic to appropriate simple and Weyl modules for the non-twisted hyper loop algebras, respectively, via restriction of the action.

Introduction

In the last years, there has been an intense study of the finite-dimensional representation theory of algebras of the form $(\mathfrak{g}\otimes A)^G$, where $\mathfrak{g}$ is a finite-dimensional simple Lie algebra over the complex numbers, A is an associative algebra and G is a group acting nontrivially on $\mathfrak{g}\otimes A$ (see [4, 8, 9, 11, 26, 27, 29] and references therein). These algebras can be regarded as generalizations of the (centerless) twisted affine Kac-Moody algebras, which are recovered in the particular case that $A = \mathbb{C}[t, t^{-1}]$ and G is generated by a Dynkin diagram automorphism σ of $\mathfrak{g}$. On the other hand, it was initiated in [14] the study of finite-dimensional representations of hyper loop algebras in positive characteristic, which is morally equivalent to studying representations of the associate affine Kac-Moody group (see the introduction of [14] for more details). The goal of this paper is to establish the basic results about the finite-dimensional representations of twisted hyper loop algebras, such as the classification of the simple modules, the development of the underlying highest-weight theory, and the existence of universal highest-weight objects, called the Weyl modules.

The hyperalgebras are constructed by considering an integral form of the corresponding universal enveloping algebra and then tensoring this form over $\mathbb{Z}$ with an arbitrary field $\mathbb{F}$, which we shall assume is algebraically closed. In the case of $\mathfrak{g}$, one considers Konstant's integral form of $U(\mathfrak{g})$ and the corresponding hyperalgebra is denoted by $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{g})$. The affine analogues of Kostant's form were obtained by Garland [12] in the non-twisted case and by Mitzman [22] in the twisted case. The corresponding hyperalgebras are denoted by $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ and $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})$, respectively. The details of the construction of these algebras are described in Section 1. Although this section is mostly dedicated to reviewing these constructions and fixing the basic notation of the paper, a few extra technical details required proof. Such details, which are proved in Section 1.7, allow us to regard $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})$ as a subalgebra of $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$, a fact not as immediate as

---

☆Partially supported by the FAPESP grant 2007/07456-9 (A. B.) and the CNPq grant 306678/2008-0 (A. M.)

Email addresses: `angelo@ime.unicamp.br` (A. B.), `aamoura@ime.unicamp.br` (A. M.)

in the characteristic zero setting – for instance, Mitzman's integral form is not a subalgebra of Garland's integral form for types $A_{2n}^{(2)}$ and $D_4^{(3)}$. In fact, for type $A_{2n}^{(2)}$, we need to suppose that the characteristic of $\mathbb{F}$ is different from 2 because, otherwise, the hyperalgebra of the simple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}_0 := \mathfrak{g}^\sigma$ is not a subalgebra of $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma)$ (see Remark 1.5). Once the inclusion $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma) \hookrightarrow U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ is established, it is possible to consider evaluation maps $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma) \to U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{g})$, which are important for the development of the representation theory.

Section 2 is dedicated to reviewing the relevant facts about the finite-dimensional representation theories of $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{g})$ and $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$. Our main results are in Sections 3 and 4.

In Section, 3 we obtain the basic results of the theory mentioned at the end of the first paragraph of this introduction. We begin by developing the relevant weight theory, called ℓ-weight theory, which will lead to the notion of Drinfeld polynomials. Still in Section 3.1, we obtain a set of relations satisfied by any highest-ℓ-weight vector generating a finite-dimensional module (Proposition 3.2). Then, in Section 3.2, we prove that every simple module must be a highest-ℓ-weight module with a particular kind of highest ℓ-weight (Drinfeld polynomials), construct the evaluation modules, and compute the Drinfeld polynomials of the simple ones. This eventually leads to the classification of the finite-dimensional simple $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma)$-modules (Theorem 3.5). Next, in Section 3.3, we define the Weyl modules by generators and relations and prove that they are finite-dimensional (Theorem 3.8). It then follows from Proposition 3.2 that they are the universal finite-dimensional highest-ℓ-weight modules. No further restriction on $\mathbb{F}$ are required in the development of this section. It is worth remarking that, once this results are established, one can pass to the case of non-algebraically closed ground fields by using the approach of [15]. In fact, the same proofs can be used *mutatis-mutandis* and the same is true for the results of [16].

In the last section, we prove the positive characteristic analogue of a result of [4] stating that the simple modules and the Weyl modules for $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma)$ can be obtained by restriction of the action from appropriate simple and Weyl modules for $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$, respectively (Theorem 4.1). However, we need to suppose that the characteristic of $\mathbb{F}$ is not equal to the order of the Dynkin diagram automorphism σ. Moreover, the proof of Theorem 4.1 in the case of Weyl modules is the only proof of the paper which could not be performed intrinsically in the context of hyperalgebras. Instead, we had to use the characteristic zero version of the result and apply the technique of reduction modulo p. In particular, this part of the proof depends on a conjecture on the independence of the dimension of the Weyl modules on the ground field (see Remark 4.11 for comments on the proof of this conjecture).

Acknowledgments: The results of this paper were obtained during the Ph.D. studies of the first author under the supervision of the second author. We thank A. Engler and P. Brumatti for useful discussions and helpful references about Henselian discrete valuation rings.

1. The algebras

Throughout this work, $\mathbb{C}$ (respectively $\mathbb{C}^\times$) denotes the set of complex (respectively nonzero complex) numbers and $\mathbb{Z}$ (respectively $\mathbb{Z}_+$ and $\mathbb{N}$) is the set of integers (respectively non-negative and positive integers).

1.1. *Simple Lie algebras and diagram automorphisms*

Let I be the set of vertices of a finite-type and connected Dynkin diagram and let $\mathfrak{g}$ be the associated finite-dimensional simple Lie algebra over $\mathbb{C}$. Fix a triangular decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{n}^- \oplus \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{n}^+$ and denote by R and R^+ the associated root system and set of positive roots. Let $\{\alpha_i : i \in I\}$ (resp. $\{\omega_i : i \in I\}$) denote the simple roots (resp. fundamental weights) and set $Q = \oplus_{i \in I}\mathbb{Z}\alpha_i, Q^+ = \oplus_{i \in I}\mathbb{Z}_+\alpha_i, P = \oplus_{i \in I}\mathbb{Z}\omega_i$, and $P^+ = \oplus_{i \in I}\mathbb{Z}_+\omega_i$. Let $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ $(\alpha \in R)$ denote the associated root space and let θ be the highest root of $\mathfrak{g}$.

Fix a diagram automorphism σ of $\mathfrak{g}$ and let $m \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ be its order. It induces a permutation of R given by

$$\sigma\left(\sum_{i \in I} n_i\alpha_i\right) = \sum_{i \in I} n_i\alpha_{\sigma(i)}$$

and a unique Lie algebra automorphism of $\mathfrak{g}$ defined by $\sigma(x_i^\pm) = x_{\sigma(i)}^\pm$ for all $i \in I$. For $\alpha \in R^+$, set

$$\Gamma_\alpha = \#\,\{\sigma^j(\alpha) : j \in \mathbb{Z}\}$$

and notice that $\Gamma_\alpha \in \{1, m\}$. Observe also that $\sigma(\mathfrak{g}_\alpha) = \mathfrak{g}_{\sigma(\alpha)}$ for all $\alpha \in R$. If ζ is a primitive m^{th} root of unity and $\mathfrak{g}_\epsilon = \{x \in \mathfrak{g} : \sigma(x) = \zeta^\epsilon x\}$, then

$$\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{\epsilon = 0}^{m-1} \mathfrak{g}_\epsilon \quad \text{and} \quad [\mathfrak{g}_\epsilon, \mathfrak{g}_{\epsilon'}] \subseteq \mathfrak{g}_{\overline{\epsilon+\epsilon'}}$$

where $\overline{\epsilon + \epsilon'}$ is the remainder of the division of $\epsilon + \epsilon'$ by m (henceforth, we will abuse of notation and write $\epsilon + \epsilon'$ instead of $\overline{\epsilon + \epsilon'}$). In particular, $\mathfrak{g}_0$ is a subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathfrak{g}_\epsilon$ is a $\mathfrak{g}_0$-module for $0 \leq \epsilon < m$. It is well-known that $\mathfrak{g}_0$ is simple and that $\mathfrak{g}_\epsilon$ is a simple $\mathfrak{g}_0$-module for all $0 \leq \epsilon < m$ (cf. [18, Chap. VIII]). Moreover, $\mathfrak{g}_1 \cong_{\mathfrak{g}_0} \mathfrak{g}_2$ if $m = 3$.

If $\mathfrak{a}$ is a subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ and $0 \leq \epsilon < m$, set $\mathfrak{a}_\epsilon = \mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{g}_\epsilon$. Then, $\mathfrak{h}_0$ is a Cartan subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}_0$ and $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{n}_0^+ \oplus \mathfrak{h}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{n}_0^-$. Let I_0 be the set of vertices of the Dynkin diagram of $\mathfrak{g}_0$ and R_0 the root system determined by $\mathfrak{h}_0$. The simple roots and fundamental weights of $\mathfrak{g}_0$ determined by the aforementioned triangular decomposition of $\mathfrak{g}_0$ will be also denoted by α_i and ω_i for $i \in I_0$, as this should not cause confusion with those of $\mathfrak{g}$. The root and weight lattices will be denoted by Q_0 and P_0 and the sets Q_0^+ and P_0^+ are defined in the usual way. Similarly, R_0^+ will denote the corresponding set of positive roots. We let R_s and R_l be the subsets of R_0^+ corresponding to short and long roots, respectively.

If V is a finite-dimensional representation of $\mathfrak{g}$ or of $\mathfrak{g}_0$, let $\mathrm{wt}(V)$ be the set of weights of V. It is well-known that $(\mathfrak{g}_\epsilon)_0 = \mathfrak{h}_\epsilon$ and, if $\mu \neq 0$, then $(\mathfrak{g}_\epsilon)_\mu$ is one-dimensional for all ϵ. We record the following table with information about $\mathfrak{g}_\epsilon$ according to $\mathfrak{g}$ and σ.

$\mathfrak{g}$	m	$\mathfrak{g}_0$	$\mathrm{wt}(\mathfrak{g}_1) \setminus \{0\}$	Dynkin diagram of $\mathfrak{g}_0$
A_2	2	A_1	$\pm R_0 \cup \{\pm 2\alpha : \alpha \in R_s\}$	○ 1
$A_{2n}, n \geq 2$	2	B_n	$\pm R_0 \cup \{\pm 2\alpha : \alpha \in R_s\}$	○ — ○ — · · · — ○ ⇒ ○ 1 2 n−1 n
$A_{2n-1}, n \geq 2$	2	C_n	$\pm R_s$	○ — ○ — · · · — ○ ⇐ ○ 1 2 n−1 n
$D_{n+1}, n \geq 3$	2	B_n	$\pm R_s$	○ — ○ — · · · — ○ ⇒ ○ 1 2 n−1 n
E_6	2	F_4	$\pm R_s$	○ — ○ ⇐ ○ — ○ 1 2 3 4
D_4	3	G_2	$\pm R_s$	○ ⇛ ○ 1 2

1.2. *Chevalley basis*

Fix a Chevalley basis $C = \{x_\alpha^\pm, h_i : \alpha \in R^+, i \in I\}$ for $\mathfrak{g}$ and, given $\alpha \in R^+$, set $h_\alpha = [x_\alpha^+, x_\alpha^-]$. For the remainder of this subsection, assume that σ is nontrivial. We review a construction of a basis of $(\mathfrak{g}_\epsilon)_\mu$, where $\mu \in \mathrm{wt}(\mathfrak{g}_\epsilon)$, in terms of this fixed Chevalley basis. It is well-known that if $\mu \neq 0$, then $\mu = \alpha|_{\mathfrak{h}_0}$ for some $\alpha \in R$ and $\alpha|_{\mathfrak{h}_0} = \beta|_{\mathfrak{h}_0}$ if and only if $\beta = \sigma^j(\alpha)$ for some $0 \le j < m$. Suppose first that $\mathfrak{g}$ is not of type A_{2n}. Then, given $\alpha \in R^+$ and $0 \le \epsilon < m$, set

$$x^\pm_{\alpha,\epsilon} = \begin{cases} \sum\limits_{j=0}^{m-1} \zeta^{j\epsilon} x^\pm_{\sigma^j(\alpha)}, & \text{if } \sigma(\alpha) \neq \alpha, \\ \delta_{0,\epsilon} x^\pm_\alpha, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \hbar_{\alpha,\epsilon} = \begin{cases} \sum\limits_{j=0}^{m-1} \zeta^{j\epsilon} h_{\sigma^j(\alpha)}, & \text{if } \sigma(\alpha) \neq \alpha, \\ \delta_{0,\epsilon} h_\alpha, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Notice that

$$(1.1) \qquad x^\pm_{\sigma(\alpha),\epsilon} = \zeta^{-\epsilon} x^\pm_{\alpha,\epsilon}, \qquad \hbar_{\sigma(\alpha),\epsilon} = \zeta^{-\epsilon}\hbar_{\alpha,\epsilon}, \qquad x^\pm_\alpha = \frac{1}{\Gamma_\alpha}\sum_{\epsilon=0}^{m-1} x^\pm_{\alpha,\epsilon}, \qquad \text{and} \qquad h_\alpha = \frac{1}{\Gamma_\alpha}\sum_{\epsilon=0}^{m-1} \hbar_{\alpha,\epsilon}.$$

Now assume $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type A_{2n}. In this case, for $\alpha \in R^+$, we have

$$\alpha = \sigma(\alpha) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \alpha|_{\mathfrak{h}_0} \in 2R_s \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \alpha = \beta + \sigma(\beta) \quad \text{for some} \quad \beta \in R^+.$$

Moreover, if β is as above, then $\beta|_{\mathfrak{h}_0} \in R_s$. It is easily seen that, for such α, we have $x^\pm_\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}_1$ and $h_\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}_0$. Thus, we set

$$x^\pm_{\alpha,\epsilon} = \delta_{1,\epsilon} x^\pm_\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \hbar_{\alpha,\epsilon} = \delta_{0,\epsilon} h_\alpha.$$

Otherwise, if $\alpha \neq \sigma(\alpha)$, set

$$x^\pm_{\alpha,\epsilon} = \begin{cases} x^\pm_\alpha + (-1)^\epsilon x^\pm_{\sigma(\alpha)}, & \text{if } \alpha|_{\mathfrak{h}_0} \in R_l, \\ \sqrt{2}\left(x^\pm_\alpha + (-1)^\epsilon x^\pm_{\sigma(\alpha)}\right), & \text{if } \alpha|_{\mathfrak{h}_0} \in R_s, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \hbar_{\alpha,\epsilon} = \begin{cases} h_\alpha + (-1)^\epsilon h_{\sigma(\alpha)}, & \text{if } \alpha|_{\mathfrak{h}_0} \in R_l, \\ 2\left(h_\alpha + (-1)^\epsilon h_{\sigma(\alpha)}\right), & \text{if } \alpha|_{\mathfrak{h}_0} \in R_s. \end{cases}$$

Observe that relations (1.1) remain valid in this case and that, if $\alpha + \sigma(\alpha) \in R^+$, we have

$$(1.2) \qquad x^\pm_{\alpha+\sigma(\alpha),1} = \frac{s}{4}[x^\pm_{\alpha,0}, x^\pm_{\alpha,1}] = s[x^\pm_\alpha, x^\pm_{\sigma(\alpha)}] \quad \text{for some} \quad s \in \{\pm 1\}.$$

It is now straightforward to check that

$$(\mathfrak{g}_\epsilon)_{\pm\mu} = \mathbb{C}x^\pm_{\alpha,\epsilon} \quad \text{if} \quad \alpha|_{\mathfrak{h}_0} = \mu \in \mathrm{wt}(\mathfrak{g}_\epsilon)$$

and that $\mathfrak{h}_\epsilon$ is spanned by the elements $h_{\alpha_i,\epsilon}$ with $i \in I$. In order to fix a basis for these spaces, we proceed as follows. Let O be a complete set of representatives of the orbits of the σ-action on R^+. Then, if $\mu \in \mathrm{wt}(\mathfrak{g}_\epsilon) \cap Q_0^+ \setminus \{0\}$, set

$$(1.3) \qquad x^\pm_{\mu,\epsilon} = x^\pm_{\alpha,\epsilon} \quad \text{where} \quad \alpha \in O, \ \alpha|_{\mathfrak{h}_0} = \mu.$$

Notice also that there exists a unique injective map $o : I_0 \longrightarrow I$ such that $\alpha_{o(i)} \in O$ for all $i \in I_0$ and set

$$h_{i,\epsilon} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}\hbar_{o(i),\epsilon}, & \text{if } \mathfrak{g} \text{ is of type } A_{2n} \text{ and } \alpha_i \in R_s, \\ \hbar_{o(i),\epsilon}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then,

$$C^\sigma(O) = \{x^\pm_{\mu,\epsilon}, h_{i,\epsilon} : 0 \le \epsilon < m, \mu \in \mathrm{wt}(\mathfrak{g}_\epsilon) \cap Q_0^+ \setminus \{0\}, i \in I_0\} \setminus \{0\}$$

is a basis of $\mathfrak{g}$. For notational convenience, for $\mathfrak{g}$ of type A_{2n}, we shall assume that O is chosen in such a way that $s = 1$ in (1.2). In the case that $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type D_4 and $m = 3$, it is convenient to choose O in a more specific way. Namely, let $j \in I$ be the unique vertex fixed by σ and choose $i \in I$ such that $\sigma(i) \neq i$. Then set

$$O_i = \{\alpha \in R^+ : \sigma(\alpha) = \alpha\} \cup \{\alpha_i, \alpha_j + \alpha_i, \alpha_j + \sigma(\alpha_i) + \sigma^2(\alpha_i)\}.$$

The reason for such choices is Theorem 1.4 below. In particular, the brackets of elements of $C^\sigma(O)$ are in the $\mathbb{Z}$-span of $C^\sigma(O)$. We shall need some of these brackets explicitly for later use and we record them in the next lemma. For notational convenience, we set $x^\pm_{\mu,\epsilon} = 0$ if $\mu \notin \mathrm{wt}(\mathfrak{g}_\epsilon)$ and, if $\alpha \in O$ is such that $\mu = \alpha|_{\mathfrak{h}_0}$, we set $h_{\mu,\epsilon} = h_{\alpha,\epsilon}$.

Lemma 1.1. Let $0 \le \epsilon, \epsilon' < m$. Given $\mu \in R_0^+$, $\nu \in \mathrm{wt}(\mathfrak{g}_\epsilon) \cap Q_0^+ \backslash \{0\}$ and $\eta \in \mathrm{wt}(\mathfrak{g}_\epsilon) \cap \mathrm{wt}(\mathfrak{g}_{\epsilon'}) \cap Q_0^+ \backslash \{0\}$, we have:

(a) $[h_{\mu,0}, x^\pm_{\nu,\epsilon}] = \pm \nu(h_{\mu,0}) x^\pm_{\nu,\epsilon}$.

(b) $[x^+_{\eta,\epsilon}, x^-_{\eta,\epsilon'}] = \begin{cases} 2h_{\eta,\epsilon+\epsilon'}, & \text{if } \eta \in R_s \text{ and } \mathfrak{g} \text{ is of type } A_{2n}, \\ \delta_{\epsilon\epsilon',1} h_{\frac{\eta}{2},0}, & \text{if } \eta \in 2R_s \text{ and } \mathfrak{g} \text{ is of type } A_{2n}, \\ h_{\eta,\epsilon+\epsilon'}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$

(c) If $h_{\nu,1} \ne 0$, then $[h_{\nu,1}, x^\pm_{\nu,\epsilon}] = \begin{cases} \pm 3x^\pm_{\nu,\epsilon+1}, & \text{if } \nu \in R_s \text{ and } \mathfrak{g} \text{ is of type } A_{2n}, \\ \pm 2x^\pm_{\nu,\epsilon+1}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$ □

Remark 1.2. Observe that, unless $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type A_{2n}, the set $C_0^\sigma(O) = \{x^\pm_{\mu,0}, h_{i,0} : \mu \in R_0^+, i \in I_0\}$ is a Chevalley basis of $\mathfrak{g}_0$ (this does not depend on the more specific choice of O in the case $m = 3$). For $\mathfrak{g}$ of type A_{2n}, a Chevalley basis is obtained from $C_0^\sigma(O)$ by replacing the element $h_{j,0}$, where j is the unique element of I_0 such that $\alpha_j \in R_s$, by the element $\hbar_{o(j),\epsilon} = 2h_{j,0}$.

1.3. *Loop algebras*

Given a vector space $\mathfrak{a}$ over $\mathbb{C}$, consider its loop space $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}} = \mathfrak{a} \otimes \mathbb{C}[t, t^{-1}]$. If $\mathfrak{a}$ is a Lie algebra, then $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}$ is also a Lie algebra, called the loop algebra of $\mathfrak{a}$, where the bracket is given by $[x \otimes f, y \otimes g] = [x, y] \otimes fg$ for $x, y \in \mathfrak{a}$ and $f, g \in \mathbb{C}[t, t^{-1}]$. Notice that $\mathfrak{a} \otimes 1$ is a subalgebra of $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}$ isomorphic to $\mathfrak{a}$ and, if $\mathfrak{b}$ is a subalgebra of $\mathfrak{a}$, then $\tilde{\mathfrak{b}} = \mathfrak{b} \otimes \mathbb{C}[t, t^{-1}]$ is naturally a subalgebra of $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}$. In particular, $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} = \tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^- \oplus \tilde{\mathfrak{h}} \oplus \tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^+$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}$ is an abelian subalgebra of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$. The elements $x^\pm_\alpha \otimes t^r$ and $h_i \otimes t^r$ with $\alpha \in R^+, i \in I, r \in \mathbb{Z}$, form a basis of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ which we shall refer to as a Chevalley basis following [22].

The automorphism σ of $\mathfrak{g}$ can be extended to an automorphism $\widetilde{\sigma}$ of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ by defining

$$\widetilde{\sigma}(x \otimes t^j) = \zeta^j \sigma(x) \otimes t^j,$$

for $x \in \mathfrak{g}$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. Notice that $\widetilde{\sigma}$ is also an automorphism of order m. Let $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma$ be the subalgebra of fixed points of $\widetilde{\sigma}$, which can be described as

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma = \bigoplus_{\epsilon = 0}^{m-1} \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma_\epsilon \qquad \text{where} \qquad \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma_\epsilon = \mathfrak{g}_\epsilon \otimes t^{m-\epsilon} \mathbb{C}[t^m, t^{-m}].$$

The algebra $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma$ is called the twisted loop algebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ (associated to σ). Define the σ-invariant subspaces $(\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^\pm_\epsilon)^\sigma$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}^\sigma_\epsilon$ in the obvious manner. In particular, $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma_\epsilon = (\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^-_\epsilon)^\sigma \oplus \tilde{\mathfrak{h}}^\sigma_\epsilon \oplus (\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^+_\epsilon)^\sigma$.

Given a basis of $\mathfrak{g}$ of the form $C^\sigma(O)$ as in Subsection 1.2, the associated elements of the form $x^\pm_{\mu,\epsilon} \otimes t^r, h_{i,\epsilon} \otimes t^r$ with $x_{\mu,\epsilon}, h_{i,\epsilon} \in C^\sigma(O), r \in \mathbb{Z}, \epsilon \equiv_m -r$, form a basis of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma$ which we also refer to as a Chevalley basis following [22]. The next lemma is easily established (a proof can be found in [2]; see also [4]).

Lemma 1.3. Let $\alpha \in R_0^+$.

(a) Suppose $\mathfrak{g}$ is not of type A_{2n}. If $\alpha \in R_l$, then the subspace spanned by $\{x^\pm_{\alpha,0} \otimes t^{mk}, h_{\alpha,0} \otimes t^{mk} : k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is a subalgebra of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma$ isomorphic to $\tilde{\mathfrak{sl}}_2$. Otherwise, if $\alpha \in R_s$, the subspace spanned by $\{x^\pm_{\alpha,\epsilon} \otimes t^{mk-\epsilon}, h_{\alpha,\epsilon} \otimes t^{mk-\epsilon} : k \in \mathbb{Z},\ 0 \le \epsilon < m\}$ is a subalgebra of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma$ isomorphic to $\tilde{\mathfrak{sl}}_2$.

(b) Suppose $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type A_{2n}. If $\alpha \in R_l$, then the subspace spanned by $\{x^\pm_{\alpha,\epsilon} \otimes t^{mk-\epsilon}, h_{\alpha,\epsilon} \otimes t^{mk-\epsilon} : k \in \mathbb{Z},\ 0 \le \epsilon < m\}$ is a subalgebra of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma$ isomorphic to $\tilde{\mathfrak{sl}}_2$. If $\alpha \in R_s$, then the subspace spanned by $\{x^\pm_{\alpha,\epsilon} \otimes t^{2k+\epsilon}, x^\pm_{\alpha+\sigma(\alpha),1} \otimes t^{2k+1}, h_{\alpha,\epsilon} \otimes t^{2k+\epsilon} : k \in \mathbb{Z},\ 0 \le \epsilon \le m-1\}$ is a subalgebra of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma$ isomorphic to $\tilde{\mathfrak{sl}}_3^\tau$ where τ is the nontrivial diagram automorphism of $\mathfrak{sl}_3$. □

1.4. *Hyperalgebras*

For an associative algebra A over a field of characteristic zero, $a \in A$, and $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, we set $a^{(k)} = \frac{a^k}{k!}$ and $\binom{a}{k} = \frac{a(a-1)\cdots(a-k+1)}{k!}$. We shall need the following two identities. Suppose that $x_1, \ldots, x_r$ are commuting elements of A. Then,

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^{r} x_j\right)^{(n)} = \sum_{\substack{(n_1,\ldots,n_r)\in\mathbb{Z}^m_{\geq 0}\\ n_1+\cdots+n_r=n}} (x_1)^{(n_1)} \cdots (x_r)^{(n_r)} \tag{1.4}$$

and

$$\binom{x_1 + x_2}{m} = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \binom{x_1}{j}\binom{x_2}{m-j}. \tag{1.5}$$

Let $U(\mathfrak{a})$ denote the universal enveloping algebra of a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{a}$. The PBW theorem implies that the multiplication establishes isomorphisms

$$U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}) \cong U(\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^-) \otimes U(\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}) \otimes U(\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^+) \quad \text{and} \quad U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma) \cong U((\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^-)^\sigma) \otimes U(\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}^\sigma) \otimes U((\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^+)^\sigma).$$

Given $\alpha \in R^+$, consider the following power series with coefficients in $U(\tilde{\mathfrak{h}})$:

$$\Lambda^{\pm}_{\alpha}(u) = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \Lambda_{\alpha,\pm r} u^r = \exp\left(-\sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \frac{h_\alpha \otimes t^{\pm s}}{s} u^s\right).$$

We will also need to make use of elements $\Lambda_{\alpha,r;k} \in U(\tilde{\mathfrak{h}})$, $i \in I, r, k \in \mathbb{Z}, r \neq 0, k > 0$, defined as follows. Consider the endomorphism τ_k of $U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ induced by $t \mapsto t^k$ and set

$$\Lambda^{\pm}_{\alpha;k}(u) = \sum_{r \geq 0} \Lambda_{\alpha,\pm r;k} u^r = \tau_k(\Lambda^{\pm}_{\alpha}(u)) = \exp\left(-\sum_{s>0} \frac{h_i \otimes t^{\pm sk}}{s} u^s\right).$$

We now define the twisted analogues of the above elements. If either $\mathfrak{g}$ is not of type A_{2n} and $\mu \in R_s$, or $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type A_{2n} and $\mu \in R^+_0$, set

$$\Lambda^{\sigma,\pm}_{\mu}(u) = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \Lambda^{\sigma}_{\mu,\pm r} u^r = \exp\left(-\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\sum_{\epsilon=0}^{m-1} \frac{h_{\mu,\pm\epsilon} \otimes t^{\pm(mk-\epsilon)}}{mk-\epsilon} u^{mk-\epsilon}\right),$$

and, if $\mathfrak{g}$ is not of type A_{2n} and $\mu \in R_l$, we set

$$\Lambda^{\sigma,\pm}_{\mu}(u) = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \Lambda^{\sigma}_{\mu,\pm r} u^r = \exp\left(-\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{h_{\mu,0} \otimes t^{\pm mk}}{k} u^k\right).$$

We may write $\Lambda_{i,r}$ in place of $\Lambda_{\alpha_i,r}$ and similarly for $\Lambda^{\sigma}_{\alpha_i,r}$. One can easily check the following relation among twisted and non-twisted versions of the above elements. Given $\mu \in R^+_0$, let $\alpha \in O$ such that $\alpha|_{\mathfrak{h}_0} = \mu$. Then:

$$\Lambda^{\sigma,\pm}_{\mu}(u) = \begin{cases} \prod_{j=0}^{m-1} \Lambda^{\pm}_{\sigma^j(\alpha)}(\zeta^{m-j}u), & \text{if} \quad \Gamma_\alpha = m, \\ \Lambda^{\pm}_{\alpha;m}(u), & \text{if} \quad \Gamma_\alpha = 1. \end{cases} \tag{1.6}$$

Given an order on the Chevalley basis of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma$ and a PBW monomial with respect to this order, we construct an ordered monomial in the elements of the set

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\sigma = \left\{(x^{\pm}_{\mu,-r} \otimes t^r)^{(k)},\ \Lambda^{\sigma,\pm}_{i,k},\ \binom{h_{i,0}}{k} : \mu \in \mathrm{wt}(\mathfrak{g}_{-r}) \cap Q^+_0 \setminus \{0\}, i \in I_0, r \in \mathbb{Z}, k \in \mathbb{Z}_+\right\} \setminus \{0\},$$

using the correspondence $(x^{\pm}_{\mu,-r}\otimes t^r)^k \leftrightarrow (x^{\pm}_{\mu,-r}\otimes t^r)^{(k)}$, $h^k_{i,0} \leftrightarrow \binom{h_{i,0}}{k}$ and $(h_{i,-r}\otimes t^r)^k \leftrightarrow (\Lambda^{\sigma}_{i,r})^k$ for $r\neq 0$. Using the obvious similar correspondence we consider monomials in $U(\mathfrak{g})$ formed by elements of

$$\mathcal{M} = \left\{(x^{\pm}_{\alpha})^{(k)}, \binom{h_i}{k} : \alpha\in R^+, i\in I, k\in\mathbb{Z}_+\right\}$$

and in $U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ formed by elements of

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}} = \left\{(x^{\pm}_{\alpha}\otimes t^r)^{(k)}, \Lambda^{\pm}_{i,k}, \binom{h_i}{k} : \alpha\in R^+, i\in I, k\in\mathbb{Z}_+, r\in\mathbb{Z}\right\}.$$

Notice that $\mathcal{M}$ can be naturally regarded as a subset of $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$. The set of ordered monomials thus obtained are clearly basis of $U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})$, $U(\mathfrak{g})$, and $U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$, respectively.

Let $U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathfrak{g})\subseteq U(\mathfrak{g})$, $U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})\subseteq U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$, and $U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})\subseteq U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})$ be the $\mathbb{Z}$–subalgebras generated respectively by $\{(x^{\pm}_{\alpha})^{(k)} : \alpha\in R^+, k\in\mathbb{Z}_+\}$, $\{(x^{\pm}_{\alpha}\otimes t^r)^{(k)} : \alpha\in R^+, r\in\mathbb{Z}, k\in\mathbb{Z}_+\}$, and $\{(x^{\pm}_{\mu,-r}\otimes t^r)^{(k)} : \mu\in \mathrm{wt}(\mathfrak{g}_{-r})\cap Q^+_0\setminus\{0\}, r\in\mathbb{Z}, k\in\mathbb{Z}_+\}$. The following crucial theorem was proved in [21], in the $U(\mathfrak{g})$ case, and in [12, 22] for the $U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ and $U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})$ cases (see also [28]).

Theorem 1.4. The subalgebras $U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})$, $U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathfrak{g})$, and $U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ are free $\mathbb{Z}$-modules and the sets of ordered monomials constructed from $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\sigma}$, $\mathcal{M}$, and $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ are $\mathbb{Z}$-basis of $U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})$, $U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathfrak{g})$, and $U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$, respectively. ☐

In particular, it follows that the natural map $\mathbb{C}\otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})\to U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})$ is an isomorphism, i.e., $U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})$ is a an integral form of $U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})$, and similarly for $U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ and $U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathfrak{g})$. If $\mathfrak{a}$ is a subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ preserved by σ, set

$$U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}^{\sigma}) = U(\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}^{\sigma})\cap U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})$$

and similarly define $U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathfrak{a})$ and $U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{a}})$ for any $\mathfrak{a}$ subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. Then,

$$\mathfrak{a}\in\{\mathfrak{g}_0, \mathfrak{n}^{\pm}_0, \mathfrak{h}_{\epsilon}, \tilde{\mathfrak{h}}^{\sigma}_{\epsilon}, (\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^{\pm})^{\sigma}, \mathfrak{n}^{\pm}, \mathfrak{h}, \tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^{\pm}, \tilde{\mathfrak{h}}\} \quad\Rightarrow\quad \mathbb{C}\otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathfrak{a}) \xrightarrow{\cong} U(\mathfrak{a}).$$

In fact, $U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathfrak{a})$ is a free $\mathbb{Z}$-module spanned by monomials formed by elements of $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\sigma}$ (or of $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$) belonging to $U(\mathfrak{a})$.

Remark 1.5. Notice that $U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathfrak{g}) = U(\mathfrak{g})\cap U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$, i.e., Kostant's integral form of $\mathfrak{g}$ coincides with its intersection with Garland's integral form of $U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ which allows us to regard $U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathfrak{g})$ as a $\mathbb{Z}$-subalgebra of $U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$. If $\mathfrak{g}$ is not of type A_{2n}, then $U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathfrak{g}_0)$ coincides with Kostant's integral form of $\mathfrak{g}_0$ as well. However, if $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type A_{2n} this is not true for the reason described in Remark 1.2.

Given a field $\mathbb{F}$, define the $\mathbb{F}$–hyperalgebra of $\mathfrak{a}$ by

$$U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{a}) = \mathbb{F}\otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathfrak{a})$$

where $\mathfrak{a}$ is any of the subspaces considered above. We will refer to $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})$ as the twisted hyper loop algebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ associated to σ over $\mathbb{F}$. Clearly, if the characteristic of $\mathbb{F}$ is zero, the algebra $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})$ is naturally isomorphic to $U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma}_{\mathbb{F}})$ where $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma}_{\mathbb{F}} = \mathbb{F}\otimes_{\mathbb{Z}}\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ is the $\mathbb{Z}$-span of the Chevalley basis of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma}$, and similarly for all algebras $\mathfrak{a}$ we have considered. For fields of positive characteristic we just have an algebra homomorphism $U(\mathfrak{a}_{\mathbb{F}})\to U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{a})$ which is neither injective nor surjective. We will keep denoting by x the image of an element $x\in U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathfrak{a})$ in $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{a})$. Notice that we have

$$U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}) = U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^-)U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{h}})U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^+) \quad\text{and}\quad U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma}) = U_{\mathbb{F}}((\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^-)^{\sigma})U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}^{\sigma})U_{\mathbb{F}}((\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^+)^{\sigma}).$$

Remark 1.6. If $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type A_{2n} and the characteristic of $\mathbb{F}$ is 2, then $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{g}_0)$ is not isomorphic to what is usually called the hyperalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}_0$ over $\mathbb{F}$ (which is constructed using Kostant's integral form of $U(\mathfrak{g}_0)$). Indeed, if $i\in I_0$ is the unique element such that $\alpha_i\in R_s$, then $[x^+_{\alpha_i,0}, x^-_{\alpha_i,0}] = \hbar_{o(i),\epsilon} = 2h_{i,0} = 0$ in $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{g}_0)$, but this is not zero in the usual hyperalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}_0$ over $\mathbb{F}$. On the other hand, if the characteristic of $\mathbb{F}$ is not 2, then $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{g}_0)$ is isomorphic to the usual hyperalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}_0$ over $\mathbb{F}$ (details can be found in [2]). For this reason, we shall not work with fields of characteristic 2 when $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type A_{2n}.

Remark 1.7. It was proved in [12] that the elements $\Lambda_{i,r;k}$ are part of a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis of the free $\mathbb{Z}$-module $U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{h}})$. In particular, their images in $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ are nonzero.

1.5. Hopf algebra structure

We denote by Δ, S, ϵ the usual comultiplication, antipode, and counit of $U(\mathfrak{a})$ and let $U(\mathfrak{g})^0$ denote the augmentation ideal, i.e., the kernel of ϵ. Set also $U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathfrak{a})^0 = U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathfrak{a}) \cap U(\mathfrak{a})^0$.

Notice that the Hopf algebra structure on $U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ induces a Hopf algebra structure over $\mathbb{Z}$ on $U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathfrak{a})$ for $\mathfrak{a} \in \{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{n}^{\pm}, \mathfrak{h}, \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^{\pm}, \tilde{\mathfrak{h}}, \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma}, (\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^{\pm})^{\sigma}, \tilde{\mathfrak{h}}^{\sigma}\}$. This in turn induces a Hopf algebra structure on $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{a})$. Notice also that, if $x \in \mathfrak{a}$ is such that $x^{(k)} \in U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathfrak{a})$ for all $k > 0$, then

$$\Delta(x^{(k)}) = \sum_{l=0}^{k} x^{(l)} \otimes x^{(l-k)}. \tag{1.7}$$

Also, for all $k > 0$ and $\mu \in R_0^+$, we have

$$\Delta(\Lambda_{\alpha;k}^{\pm}(u)) = \Lambda_{\alpha;k}^{\pm}(u) \otimes \Lambda_{\alpha;k}^{\pm}(u) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \Delta(\Lambda_{\mu}^{\sigma,\pm}(u)) = \Lambda_{\mu}^{\sigma,\pm}(u) \otimes \Lambda_{\mu}^{\sigma,\pm}(u). \tag{1.8}$$

Notice that (1.8) is equivalent to

$$\Delta(\Lambda_{\alpha,\pm r;k}) = \sum_{s=0}^{r} \Lambda_{\alpha,\pm s;k} \otimes \Lambda_{\alpha,\pm(r-s);k} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \Delta(\Lambda_{\mu,\pm r}^{\sigma}) = \sum_{s=0}^{r} \Lambda_{\mu,\pm s}^{\sigma} \otimes \Lambda_{\mu,\pm(r-s)}^{\sigma}$$

for all $r \geq 0$.

1.6. Some auxiliary identities

The next two lemmas are crucial in the proof of Theorem 1.4 and will also be crucial in the study of finite-dimensional representations of hyper loop algebras. Lemma 1.8 was originally proved in the $U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ setting in [12, Lemma 7.5] (our statement follows that of [14, Lemma 1.3]). Given $\alpha \in R^+$ and $s \in \mathbb{Z}$, consider the following power series with coefficients in $U(\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^-)$:

$$X_{\alpha;s,\pm}(u) = \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} (x_{\alpha}^{-} \otimes t^{\pm(r+s)}) u^r.$$

Lemma 1.8. Let $\alpha \in R^+$, $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$. Then,

$$(x_{\alpha}^{+} \otimes t^{\mp s})^{(l)} (x_{\alpha}^{-} \otimes t^{\pm(s+1)})^{(k)} = (-1)^l \left((X_{\alpha;s,\pm}^{-}(u))^{(k-l)} \Lambda_{\alpha}^{\pm}(u) \right)_k \quad \mod U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})_{\mathbb{Z}} U(\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^+)_{\mathbb{Z}}^0,$$

where the subindex k means the coefficient of u^k of the above power series. ☐

The next lemma establishes the "twisted version" of Lemma 1.8. If either $\mathfrak{g}$ is not of type A_{2n} and $\mu \in R_s$, or $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type A_{2n} and $\mu \in R_0^+$, define

$$X_{\mu;s,\pm}^{\sigma}(u) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\epsilon=0}^{m-1} (x_{\mu,\mp(s-\epsilon)}^{-} \otimes t^{\pm(mk+s-\epsilon)}) u^{mk-\epsilon},$$

for all $s \in \mathbb{Z}$. For $\mathfrak{g}$ not of type A_{2n} and $\mu \in R_l$, set

$$X_{\mu;ms,\pm}^{\sigma}(u) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (x_{\mu,0}^{-} \otimes t^{\pm(m(k+s))}) u^k,$$

for all $s \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Lemma 1.9. Let $l, k, s \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $0 \le l \le k$.

(a) If either $\mathfrak{g}$ is not of type A_{2n} and $\mu \in R_s$, or if $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type A_{2n} and $\mu \in R_l$, we have

$$(x^+_{\mu,\pm s} \otimes t^{\mp s})^{(l)}(x^-_{\mu,\mp(s+1)} \otimes t^{\pm(s+1)})^{(k)} = (-1)^l \left((X^\sigma_{\mu;s,\pm}(u))^{(k-l)}(u)\Lambda^{\sigma,\pm}_\mu(u)\right)_k \quad \bmod U_\mathbb{Z}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma)U_\mathbb{Z}((\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^+)^\sigma)^0.$$

(b) If $\mathfrak{g}$ is not of type A_{2n} and $\mu \in R_l$, we have

$$(x^+_{\mu,0} \otimes t^{\mp ms)})^{(l)}(x^-_{\mu,0} \otimes t^{\pm m(s+1)})^{(k)} = (-1)^l \left((X^\sigma_{\mu;ms,\pm}(u))^{(k-l)}\Lambda^{\sigma,\pm}_\mu(u)\right)_k \quad \bmod U_\mathbb{Z}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma)U_\mathbb{Z}((\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^+)^\sigma)^0.$$

(c) If $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type A_{2n} and $\mu \in R_s$, we have

(i) $(x^+_{\mu,0} \otimes t^{\pm s})^{(2k-a)}(x^-_{2\mu,1} \otimes t^{\mp(2s-1)})^{(k)} = -\left((X^\sigma_{\mu;0,\pm}(u))^{(a)}\Lambda^{\sigma,\pm}_\mu(u)\right)_k \quad \bmod U_\mathbb{Z}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma)U_\mathbb{Z}((\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^+)^\sigma)^0$ for $a = 0, 1$.

(ii) $(x^+_{\mu,0} \otimes 1)^{(2k)}(x^-_{2\mu,1} \otimes t)^{(k+r)} = (x^-_{2\mu,1} \otimes t)^{(r)}\Lambda^\sigma_{\mu,k} + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} X_j\Lambda^\sigma_{\mu,k-j} \quad \bmod U_\mathbb{Z}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma)U_\mathbb{Z}((\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^+)^\sigma)^0$ where $r \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and X_j is a certain $\mathbb{Z}$-linear combination of elements of the form

$$(x^-_{\mu,1} \otimes t)^{(s_1)} \cdots (x^-_{\mu,k} \otimes t^k)^{(s_k)}(x^-_{2\mu,1} \otimes t)^{(s'_1)} \cdots (x^-_{2\mu,1} \otimes t^k)^{(s_{k'})}$$

with $\sum_m s_m + 2\sum_n s_n = 2r$ and $\sum_m ms'_m + \sum_n ns_n = r + j$.

(iii) $(x^+_{2\mu,1} \otimes t^{\mp(2s+1))})^{(l)}(x^-_{2\mu,1} \otimes t^{\pm(2s+3)})^{(k)} = (-1)^l \left((X^\sigma_{2\mu;ms,\pm}(u))^{(k-l)}\Lambda^{\sigma,\pm}_{2\mu}(u)\right)_k$ $\bmod U_\mathbb{Z}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma)U_\mathbb{Z}((\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^+)^\sigma)^0$, where

$$X^\sigma_{2\mu;ms,\pm}(u) = \sum_{k=1} x_{\mu,1} \otimes t^{\pm(m(k+s)+1)}u^k \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda^{\sigma,\pm}_{2\mu}(u) = \exp\left(-\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{h_{\mu,0} \otimes t^{\pm mk}}{k}u^k\right).$$

(iv) $(x^+_{2\mu,1}\otimes t^{1-2s})^{(rk)}(x^-_{\mu,1}\otimes t^s)^{(2rk+r)} = \sum_{j=1}^{k+1}(x^-_{\mu,s+j-1}\otimes t^{s+j-1})^{(r)}\Lambda^\sigma_{rk+r-rj} + X \quad \bmod U_\mathbb{Z}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma)U_\mathbb{Z}((\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^+)^\sigma)^0$, where X is a sum of elements belonging to $(\prod_i(x^-_{2\mu,-a_i} \otimes t^{a_i})^{(r_i)})(\prod_j(x^-_{\mu,-b_j} \otimes t^{b_j})^{(s_j)})U_\mathbb{F}(\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}^\sigma)$ with $a_i, b_j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $r_i, s_j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ satisfying $0 \le r_i, s_j < k$.

Proof. Items (a) and (b) are direct consequences of Lemmas 1.8 and 1.3. All parts of (c) are particular consequences of [22, Lemma 4.4.1(ii)]. ☐

A proof of the following identity can be found in [13, Lemma 26.2].

$$(1.9) \qquad (x^+_\alpha)^{(l)}(x^-_\alpha)^{(k)} = \sum_{m=0}^{\min\{k,l\}} (x^-_\alpha)^{(k-m)}\binom{h_\alpha-k-l+2m}{m}(x^+_\alpha)^{(l-m)} \qquad \text{for all} \qquad k, l \ge 0, \alpha \in R^+.$$

Lemmas 1.8 and 1.9 can be regarded as "loop" versions of (1.9). It immediately follows that

$$(x^+_{\alpha,0})^{(l)}(x^-_{\alpha,0})^{(k)} = \sum_{m=0}^{\min\{k,l\}} (x^-_{\alpha,0})^{(k-m)}\binom{\hbar_{\alpha,0}-k-l+2m}{m}(x^+_{\alpha,0})^{(l-m)} \qquad \text{for all} \qquad k, l \ge 0, \alpha \in R^+_0.$$

The next identity is easily deduced from Lemma 1.1(a).

$$(1.10) \quad \binom{h_{i,0}}{l}(x^\pm_{\mu,-r} \otimes t^r)^{(k)} = (x^\pm_{\mu,-r} \otimes t^r)^{(k)}\binom{h_{i,0}\pm k\mu(h_{i,0})}{l} \quad \text{for all} \quad k, l > 0, r \in \mathbb{Z}, i \in I_0, x^\pm_{\mu,-r} \in C^\sigma(O).$$

Given $x^\pm_{\mu,-r} \in C^\sigma(O)$ and $k \ge 0$, define the degree of $(x^\pm_{\mu,-r}\otimes t^r)^{(k)}$ to be k. For a monomial of the form $(x^\pm_{\mu_1,-r_1} \otimes t^{r_1})^{(k_1)} \cdots (x^\pm_{\mu_l,-r_l} \otimes t^{r_l})^{(k_l)}$ (choice of ± fixed) define its degree to be $k_1 + \cdots + k_l$. The following result was proved in [22, Lemma 4.2.13].

Lemma 1.10. Let $r, s \in \mathbb{Z}, \mu \in \mathrm{wt}(\mathfrak{g}_{-r}), \nu \in \mathrm{wt}(\mathfrak{g}_{-s})$, and $k, l \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Then $(x^{\pm}_{\mu,-r} \otimes t^r)^{(k)}(x^{\pm}_{\nu,-s} \otimes t^s)^{(l)}$ is in the $\mathbb{Z}$–span of $(x^{\pm}_{\nu,-s} \otimes t^s)^{(l)}(x^{\pm}_{\mu,-r} \otimes t^r)^{(k)}$ together with monomials of degree strictly smaller than $k + l$. $\square$

The next identity is trivially established.

$$(x^{\pm}_{\mu,-r} \otimes t^r)^{(k)}(x^{\pm}_{\mu,-r} \otimes t^r)^{(l)} = \binom{k+l}{k}(x^{\pm}_{\mu,-r} \otimes t^r)^{(k+l)} \qquad \text{for all} \qquad r \in \mathbb{Z}, x^{\pm}_{\mu,-r} \in C^{\sigma}(O). \tag{1.11}$$

Notice that, if $\mathbb{F}$ has characteristic $p > 0$, (1.11) implies that $((x^{\pm}_{\mu,-r} \otimes t^r)^{(k)})^p = 0$ in $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})$.

In the case of $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type A_{2n}, we will also need the following identity on Heisenberg algebras whose checking is straightforward. Let $\mathfrak{H}$ be the 3-dimensional Heisenberg algebra $\mathfrak{H}$ generated by elements x, y, z such that $[x, y] = z$ and z being central. Then, the following identity holds in $U(\mathfrak{H})$:

$$(x + y)^{(n)} = \sum_{\substack{0 \le k \le n \\ n \equiv_2 k}} (-z/2)^{(\frac{n-k}{2})} \sum_{r=0}^{k} x^{(r)} y^{(k-r)}. \tag{1.12}$$

1.7. Discrete valuation rings and evaluation maps

Following [14], given an algebraically closed field $\mathbb{F}$, let $\mathbb{A}$ be a Henselian discrete valuation ring of characteristic zero having $\mathbb{F}$ as its residue field (cf. [7, Theorem 12.4.1, Example 18.3.4(3)]). Set $U_{\mathbb{A}}(\mathfrak{a}) = \mathbb{A} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathfrak{a})$ whenever $U_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathfrak{a})$ has been defined. Clearly

$$U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{a}) \cong \mathbb{F} \otimes_{\mathbb{A}} U_{\mathbb{A}}(\mathfrak{a}).$$

Lemma 1.11. Let $\mathbb{A}$ and $\mathbb{F}$ be as above.

(a) If either $m \neq 3$ or the characteristic of $\mathbb{F}$ is not 3, then $\zeta \in \mathbb{A}$.

(b) If $m = 3$ and the characteristic of $\mathbb{F}$ is 3, then $\mathbb{A}[\zeta]$ is also a discrete valuation ring with the same residue field $\mathbb{F}$.

(c) If the characteristic of $\mathbb{F}$ is not 2, then $\sqrt{2} \in \mathbb{A}$.

Proof. If $m \neq 3$ then $\zeta = -1$ and part (a) follows immediately. If the characteristic of $\mathbb{F}$ is not 3 and $m = 3$, then the 3-cyclotomic polynomial $\Phi_3(x) = x^2 + x + 1 \in \mathbb{A}[x]$ has a root in $\mathbb{A}$ since its reduction to $\mathbb{F}$ splits ($\mathbb{F}$ is algebraically closed) and the conclusion of part (a) follows from Hensel's property of $\mathbb{A}$ (cf. [7, Theorem 18.1.2]). Similarly, if the characteristic of $\mathbb{F}$ is not 2, then $\phi(x) = x^2 - 2 \in \mathbb{A}[x]$ splits in $\mathbb{F}$ and we conclude that $\sqrt{2} \in \mathbb{A}$ by using Hensel's property once more. Finally, for proving (b), note that $\phi(x) := \Phi_3(x + 1) = x^2 + 3x + 3$ is an Eisenstein polynomial relative to the maximal ideal of $\mathbb{A}$ (since 3 belongs to this ideal). Hence, by considering the isomorphism $\rho : \mathbb{A}[x] \to \mathbb{A}[x]$ defined by $x \mapsto x + 1$ we have $\mathbb{A}[\zeta] \cong \frac{\mathbb{A}[x]}{(\Phi_3(x))} \cong \frac{\mathbb{A}[x]}{(\phi(x))}$ and the claim follows from [30, Ch. 1, Prop. 17]. $\square$

By the statements of parts (a) and (b) of the Lemma 1.11, we can and do assume that $\zeta \in \mathbb{A}$.

Remark 1.12. By working with $\mathbb{A}$ instead of $\mathbb{Z}$ (and assuming that $\zeta \in \mathbb{A}$) we make viable several constructions such as the evaluation maps which will be presented next. Also, the extra care in the choice of O for the case $m = 3$ which we made in the Subsection 1.2 becomes unnecessary, i.e., Theorem 1.4 remains valid replacing $\mathbb{Z}$ by $\mathbb{A}$ without the special choice of O.

Proposition 1.13. $U_{\mathbb{A}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})$ is an $\mathbb{A}$-subalgebra of $U_{\mathbb{A}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ and the inclusion $U_{\mathbb{A}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma}) \hookrightarrow U_{\mathbb{A}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ induces an inclusion of $\mathbb{F}$-algebras $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma}) \hookrightarrow U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$.

Proof. Given $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\mu \in \mathrm{wt}(\mathfrak{g}_k)$, let $\alpha \in O$ be such that $\alpha|_{\mathfrak{h}_0} = \mu$ so that $x^{\pm}_{\mu,k} \otimes t^{-k} = \sum_{j=0}^{\Gamma_\alpha} \zeta^{jk} x^{\pm}_{\sigma^j(\alpha)} \otimes t^{-k}$. Assume first that $\alpha + \sigma(\alpha) \notin R$. Then, since $\{x^{\pm}_{\sigma^j(\alpha)} : j = 0, \dots, m-1\}$ is a commuting set of elements of $\mathfrak{g}$, it follows from (1.4) (using that $\zeta \in \mathbb{A}$) that $\left(x^{\pm}_{\mu,k} \otimes t^{-k}\right)^{(n)} \in U_{\mathbb{A}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$.

If $\alpha + \sigma(\alpha) \in R$, then $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type A_{2n} and, by our assumptions, $\mathbb{F}$ has characteristic different than 2. In particular, $2, \sqrt{2} \in \mathbb{A}^\times$. Moreover, $\alpha|_{\mathfrak{h}_0} \in R_s$ and $x^{\pm}_{\mu,k} \otimes t^{-k} = \sqrt{2}\left(x^{\pm}_{\alpha} \otimes t^{-k} + (-1)^k x^{\pm}_{\sigma(\alpha)} \otimes t^{-k}\right) \in U_{\mathbb{A}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$. Furthermore, the subalgebra of $\mathfrak{n}^{\pm}$ generated by $x^{\pm}_{\alpha}$ and $x^{\pm}_{\sigma(\alpha)}$ is a Heisenberg subalgebra with central element $x^{\pm}_{\alpha+\sigma(\alpha)}$. Then, it follows from (1.12) that $\left(x^{\pm}_{\mu,k} \otimes t^{-k}\right)^{(n)}$ is in the $\mathbb{A}$-span of elements of the form

$$(x^{\pm}_{\alpha} \otimes t^{-k})^{(n_1)} (x^{\pm}_{\sigma(\alpha)} \otimes t^{-k})^{(n_2)} (x^{\pm}_{\alpha+\sigma(\alpha)} \otimes t^{-2k})^{(n_3)} \quad \text{with} \quad n_1 + n_2 + 2n_3 = n.$$

with coefficients in $\mathbb{A}^\times$. In particular, $\left(x^{\pm}_{\mu,k} \otimes t^{-k}\right)^{(n)} \in U_{\mathbb{A}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$. This completes the proof of the first statement.

For proving the second statement, it suffices to prove that every $\mathbb{A}$-basis element of $U_{\mathbb{A}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma)$ is written as an $\mathbb{A}$-linear combination of basis elements of $U_{\mathbb{A}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ and at least one of the coordinates lie in $\mathbb{A}^\times$. We already observed above that this is true for the elements $\left(x^{\pm}_{\mu,k} \otimes t^{-k}\right)^{(n)}$. From here it is easy to deduce that the same property holds for the basis elements of $U_{\mathbb{A}}((\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^{\pm})^\sigma)$ of the form $\prod_j (x^{\pm}_{\mu_j,k_j} \otimes t^{-k_j})^{(n_j)}$ with $\mu_j \in \mathrm{wt}(\mathfrak{g}_{k_j}) \cap Q_0^+$ and $\mu_j \neq \mu_i$ for all $i \neq j$. In fact, as in the previous paragraph, each factor of this product can be written as a linear combination of some elements in $U_{\mathbb{A}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ with coefficients in $\mathbb{A}^\times$. By taking in each of these linear combinations a term with the highest exponent (for instance, in a sum

$$\sum_i a_i (x^{\pm}_{\beta_i} \otimes t^{-k_i})^{(n_i)} (x^{\pm}_{\sigma(\beta_i)} \otimes t^{-k_i})^{(n-n_i)} \quad \text{where} \quad a_i \in \mathbb{A}^\times \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \leq n_i \leq n,$$

take $(x^{\pm}_{\beta_i} \otimes t^{-k_i})^{(n_i)}$ with $n_i = n$, or $(x^{\pm}_{\sigma(\beta_i)} \otimes t^{-k_i})^{(n_i)}$ with $n_i = n$), we conclude that the product of these collected terms has coefficient in $\mathbb{A}^\times$ and it appears only once in the expansion of the product $\prod_j (x^{\pm}_{\mu_j,k_j} \otimes t^{-k_j})^{(n_j)}$. If this term is in the PBW-order of the Chevalley basis of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$, we are done. Otherwise, we use Lemma 1.10 to produce the term in the correct order and notice that this term has the same coefficient as before.

It remains to consider the basis elements of $U_{\mathbb{A}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}^\sigma)$. For the elements of the form $\binom{h_{o(i)}}{k}$ for $i \in I_0$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, recall that

$$h_{i,\epsilon} = \sum_{j=0}^{\Gamma_{\alpha_{o(i)}}-1} \zeta^{j\epsilon} h_{\sigma^j(o(i))}.$$

Using (1.5) we see that $\binom{h_{i,0}}{k}$ is in the span of elements of the form

$$\prod_{j=1}^{\Gamma_{\alpha_{o(i)}}} \binom{h_{\sigma^j(o(i))}}{k_j} \qquad \text{with} \qquad \sum_{j=1}^{\Gamma_{\alpha_{o(i)}}} k_j = k.$$

Furthermore, the coefficient of the term $\binom{h_{o(i)}}{k}$ is 1. Next, notice that, if $o(i)$ is not fixed by σ, then

$$\Lambda^{\sigma,\pm}_{\alpha_i}(u) = \prod_{j=0}^{m-1} \Lambda^{\pm}_{\sigma^j(\alpha_{o(i)})}(\zeta^{m-j} u).$$

Given $r > 0$, it follows that $\Lambda^{\sigma}_{\alpha_i,\pm r}$ is in the $\mathbb{A}$-span of elements of the form

$$\prod_{j=1}^{m} \Lambda_{\sigma^j(\alpha_{o(i)}),\pm r_j} \qquad \text{with} \qquad \sum_{j=1}^{m} r_j = r.$$

Moreover, the coefficient of the term $\Lambda_{\alpha_{o(i)},\pm r}$ is $\zeta^{\pm mr} \in \mathbb{A}^\times$. Finally, if $o(i)$ is fixed by σ, then

$$\Lambda^{\sigma,\pm}_{\alpha_i}(u) = \Lambda^{\pm}_{\alpha_{o(i)};m}(u).$$

In particular, $\Lambda^{\sigma}_{i,r} = \Lambda_{o(i),r;m}$ is an element of an $\mathbb{A}$-basis of $U_{\mathbb{A}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{h}})$ by Remark 1.7. The case of products of such elements is easily deduced from here. ☐

Recall from [14, Proposition 3.3] that there exists a natural surjective map of $\mathbb{A}$-algebras ev : $U_{\mathbb{A}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}) \to U_{\mathbb{A}}(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes_{\mathbb{A}} \mathbb{A}[t,t^{-1}]$ induced by the identity map $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} \to \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$. Denote by ev^σ the composition of ev with the inclusion given by the above proposition. This induces an $\mathbb{F}$-algebra map

$$\mathrm{ev}^\sigma : U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma) \to U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes \mathbb{F}[t,t^{-1}].$$

In particular, given $a \in \mathbb{F}^\times$, we have an $\mathbb{F}$-algebra map

$$\mathrm{ev}^\sigma_a : U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma) \to U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{g})$$

given by the composition of ev^σ with the evaluation map $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes \mathbb{F}[t,t^{-1}] \to U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{g})$ defined by $x \otimes f(t) \mapsto f(a)x$. Similarly, we have a map $\mathrm{ev}_a : U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}) \to U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{g})$. We shall refer to the map ev (respectively, ev^σ) as the (twisted) formal evaluation map and to the map ev_a (respectively, ev^σ_a) as the (twisted) evaluation map at a. Notice that

$$\mathrm{ev}_a((x^\pm_\alpha \otimes t^r)^{(k)}) = a^{rk}(x^\pm_\alpha)^{(k)} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathrm{ev}_a(\Lambda_{\alpha,r}) = (-a)^r \binom{h_\alpha}{|r|}. \tag{1.13}$$

In particular,

$$\mathrm{ev}^\sigma_a((x^\pm_{\mu,-r} \otimes t^r)^{(k)}) = a^{rk}(x^\pm_{\mu,-r})^{(k)} \quad \text{for all} \quad r \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Moreover, if $\mu \in R^+_0$ and $\alpha \in O$ are such that $\alpha|_{\mathfrak{h}_0} = \mu$, then (1.6) implies

$$\mathrm{ev}^\sigma_a(\Lambda^\sigma_{\mu,\pm r}) = \begin{cases} (-a)^{\pm r} \sum\limits_{\substack{r_0,\cdots,r_{m-1} \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \\ r_0+\cdots+r_{m-1}=r}} \prod\limits_{j=0}^{m-1} \zeta^{-jr_j} \binom{h_{\sigma^j(\alpha)}}{r_j}, & \text{if } \Gamma_\alpha = m, \\ (-a^m)^{\pm r} \binom{h_\alpha}{r}, & \text{if } \Gamma_\alpha = 1 \end{cases} \tag{1.14}$$

for all $r \in \mathbb{Z}_+$.

2. Finite-dimensional representations of $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{g})$ and $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$

In this section we review some results on finite-dimensional representations of $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{g})$ and of $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ which will be relevant for our purposes.

2.1. *$U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{g})$-modules*

All results stated here can be found in [13] in the characteristic zero setting. The literature for the positive characteristic setting is more often found in the context of algebraic groups as in [17] and a more detailed review in the present context can be found in [14, Section 2]. Evidently, similar results apply for $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{g}_0)$-modules. Let $\leq$ denote the usual partial order $\mathfrak{h}^*$ and let $\mathcal{W}$ be the Weyl group of $\mathfrak{g}$. The longest element of $\mathcal{W}$ is denoted by w_0.

Let V be a $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{g})$–module. A nonzero vector $v \in V$ is called a weight vector if there exists $\mu \in U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{h})^*$ such that $hv = \mu(h)v$ for all $h \in U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{h})$. The subspace spanned by weight vectors of weight μ (the weight space of weight μ) will be denoted by V_μ. If $V = \bigoplus_{\mu \in U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{h})^*} V_\mu$, then V is said to be a weight module. If $V_\mu \neq 0$, μ is said to be a weight of V and we let

$$\mathrm{wt}(V) = \{\mu \in U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{h})^* : V_\mu \neq 0\}.$$

Notice that we have an inclusion $P \hookrightarrow U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{h})^*$ determined by

$$\mu\left(\binom{h_i}{k}\right) = \binom{\mu(h_i)}{k} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(xy) = \mu(x)\mu(y) \quad \text{for all} \quad i \in I, k \geq 0, x, y \in U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{h}).$$

In particular, we can consider the partial order $\leq$ on $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{h})^*$ given by $\mu \leq \lambda$ if $\lambda - \mu \in Q^+$ and we have

$$(x_\alpha^\pm)^{(k)} V_\mu \subseteq V_{\mu \pm k\alpha} \quad \text{for all} \quad \alpha \in R^+, k > 0, \mu \in U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{h})^*.$$

If V is a weight-module with finite-dimensional weight spaces, its character is the function $\mathrm{ch}(V) : U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{h})^* \to \mathbb{Z}$ given by $\mathrm{ch}(V)(\mu) = \dim V_\mu$. As usual, if V is finite-dimensional, $\mathrm{ch}(V)$ can be regarded as an element of the group ring $\mathbb{Z}[U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{h})^*]$ where we denote the element of $\mathbb{Z}[U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{h})^*]$ corresponding to $\mu \in U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{h})^*$ by e^μ. Notice that the group ring $\mathbb{Z}[P]$ can be naturally regarded as a subring of $\mathbb{Z}[U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{h})^*]$ and, moreover, the action of $\mathcal{W}$ on P extends naturally to an action of $\mathcal{W}$ on $\mathbb{Z}[P]$ by ring homomorphisms.

If v is a weight vector such that $(x_\alpha^+)^{(k)} v = 0$ for all $\alpha \in R^+, k > 0$, then v is said to be a highest-weight vector and V is said to be a highest-weight module if it is generated by a highest-weight vector. Similarly, one defines the notions of lowest-weight vectors and modules by replacing $(x_\alpha^+)^{(k)}$ by $(x_\alpha^-)^{(k)}$.

Theorem 2.1. Let V be a $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{g})$-module.

(a) If V is finite-dimensional, then V is a weight-module. Moreover, $V_\mu \neq 0$ only if $\mu \in P$, and $\dim V_\mu = \dim V_{w\mu}$ for all $w \in \mathcal{W}$. In particular, $\mathrm{ch}(V) \in \mathbb{Z}[P]^{\mathcal{W}}$.

(b) If V is a highest-weight module of highest weight λ, then $\dim(V_\lambda) = 1$ and $V_\mu \neq 0$ only if $\mu \leq \lambda$. Moreover, V has a unique maximal proper submodule and, hence, also a unique irreducible quotient. In particular, V is indecomposable.

(c) For each $\lambda \in P^+$, the $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{g})$-module $W_{\mathbb{F}}(\lambda)$ generated by a vector v satisfying the defining relations

$$(x_\alpha^+)^{(k)} v = 0, \quad hv = \lambda(h)v \quad \text{and} \quad (x_i^-)^{(l)} v = 0,$$

for all $\alpha \in R^+, h \in U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{h}), i \in I, k > 0$ and $l > \lambda(h_i)$, is nonzero and finite-dimensional. Moreover, every finite-dimensional highest-weight module of highest weight λ is a quotient of $W_{\mathbb{F}}(\lambda)$.

(d) If V is finite-dimensional and irreducible, then there exists a unique $\lambda \in P^+$ such that V is isomorphic to the irreducible quotient $V_{\mathbb{F}}(\lambda)$ of $W_{\mathbb{F}}(\lambda)$.

(e) The character of $W_{\mathbb{F}}(\lambda), \lambda \in P^+$, is given by the Weyl character formula. In particular, $\mu \in \mathrm{wt}(W_{\mathbb{F}}(\lambda))$ if, and only if, $w\mu \leq \lambda$ for all $w \in \mathcal{W}$. Moreover, $W_{\mathbb{F}}(\lambda)$ is a lowest-weight module with lowest weight $w_0\lambda$. □

The module $W_{\mathbb{F}}(\lambda)$ defined in this theorem is called the Weyl module of highest weight λ.

Theorem 2.2. Suppose $\mathbb{F}$ has characteristic zero. Then, every finite-dimensional $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{g})$-module is completely reducible. In particular, $W_{\mathbb{F}}(\lambda)$ is simple for all $\lambda \in P^+$. □

2.2. $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$-*modules*

We now recall some basic results about the category of finite-dimensional $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$-modules in the same spirit of the previous section. All the results of this subsection and the next can be found in [14] and references therein.

We denote by $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}^+$ the multiplicative monoid consisting of all families of the form $\boldsymbol{\omega} = (\boldsymbol{\omega}_i)_{i\in I}$ where each $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i$ is a polynomial in $\mathbb{F}[u]$ with constant term 1. We also denote by $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}$ the multiplicative group associated to $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}^+$ which will be referred to as the ℓ-weight lattice associated to $\mathfrak{g}$. Given $\mu \in P$ and $a \in \mathbb{F}^\times$, let $\boldsymbol{\omega}_{\mu,a}$ be the element of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}$ defined as

$$(\boldsymbol{\omega}_{\mu,a})_i(u) = (1 - au)^{\mu(h_i)} \quad \text{for all} \quad i \in I.$$

If $\mu = \omega_i$ is a fundamental weight, we simplify notation and write $\boldsymbol{\omega}_{i,a}$ and refer to it as a fundamental ℓ-weight. Notice that $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}$ is the free abelian group on the set of fundamental ℓ-weights. Let $\mathrm{wt} : \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}} \to P$ be the unique group homomorphism such that $\mathrm{wt}(\boldsymbol{\omega}_{i,a}) = \omega_i$ for all $i \in I, a \in \mathbb{F}^\times$. Let also $\boldsymbol{\omega} \mapsto \boldsymbol{\omega}^-$ be the unique group automorphism of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}$ mapping $\boldsymbol{\omega}_{i,a}$ to $\boldsymbol{\omega}_{i,a^{-1}}$ for all $i \in I, a \in \mathbb{F}^\times$. For notational convenience we set $\boldsymbol{\omega}^+ = \boldsymbol{\omega}$.

The abelian group $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}$ can be identified with a subgroup of the monoid of $|I|$-tuples of formal power series with coefficients in $\mathbb{F}$ by identifying the rational function $(1 - au)^{-1}$ with the corresponding geometric formal power series. This allows us to define an inclusion $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}} \hookrightarrow (U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}))^*$ determined by

$$\boldsymbol{\omega}\left(\binom{h_i}{k}\right) = \binom{\mathrm{wt}(\boldsymbol{\omega})(h_i)}{k}, \quad \boldsymbol{\omega}(\Lambda_{i,r}) = \omega_{i,r}, \quad \text{for all} \quad i \in I, r, k \in \mathbb{Z}, k \geq 0,$$
$$\text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{\omega}(xy) = \boldsymbol{\omega}(x)\boldsymbol{\omega}(y), \quad \text{for all} \quad x, y \in U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}).$$

Here, $\omega_{i,\pm r}$ is the coefficient of u^r in the i-th formal power series of $\boldsymbol{\omega}^{\pm}$.

Given a $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$-module V and $\xi \in U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{h}})^*$, let

$$V_\xi = \{v \in V : \text{ for all } x \in U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}), \text{ there exists } k > 0 \text{ such that } (x - \xi(x))^k v = 0\}.$$

We say that V is an ℓ-weight module if

$$V = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\omega} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}} V_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}.$$

In that case, it follows that

$$V_\mu = \bigoplus_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\omega} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}: \\ \mathrm{wt}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = \mu}} V_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \quad \text{for all} \quad \mu \in P \quad \text{and} \quad V = \bigoplus_{\mu \in P} V_\mu.$$

A nonzero element of $V_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$ is said to be an ℓ-weight vector of ℓ-weight $\boldsymbol{\omega}$. An ℓ-weight vector v is said to be a highest-ℓ-weight vector if $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{h}})v = \mathbb{F}v$ and $(x_{\alpha,r}^+)^{(k)}v = 0$ for all $\alpha \in R^+$ and all $r, k \in \mathbb{Z}, k > 0$. If V is generated by a highest-ℓ-weight vector of ℓ-weight $\boldsymbol{\omega}$, V is said to be a highest-ℓ-weight module of highest ℓ-weight $\boldsymbol{\omega}$.

Theorem 2.3. Let V be a $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$-module.

(a) If V is finite-dimensional, then V is an ℓ-weight module. In particular, if V is finite-dimensional and irreducible, then V is a highest-ℓ-weight module whose highest ℓ-weight lies in $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}^+$.

(b) If V is a highest-ℓ-weight module of highest ℓ-weight $\boldsymbol{\omega} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}^+$, then $\dim V_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} = 1$ and $V_\mu \neq 0$ only if $\mu \leq \mathrm{wt}(\omega)$. Moreover, V has a unique maximal proper submodule and, hence, also a unique irreducible quotient. In particular, V is indecomposable.

(c) For each $\omega \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}^{+}$, the $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$-module $W_{\mathbb{F}}(\omega)$ generated by a vector v satisfying the defining relations of being a highest-ℓ-weight vector of ℓ-weight $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ and

$$(x_{\alpha}^{-})^{(l)}v = 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad \alpha \in R^{+}, l > \mathrm{wt}(\omega)(h_{\alpha}),$$

is nonzero and finite-dimensional. Moreover, every finite-dimensional highest-ℓ-weight-module of highest ℓ-weight $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ is a quotient of $W_{\mathbb{F}}(\omega)$.

(d) If V is finite-dimensional and irreducible, then there exists a unique $\boldsymbol{\omega} \in P^{+}$ such that V is isomorphic to the irreducible quotient $V_{\mathbb{F}}(\omega)$ of $W_{\mathbb{F}}(\omega)$.

(e) For $\mu \in P$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}^{+}$, we have $\mu \in \mathrm{wt}(W_{\mathbb{F}}(\omega))$ if and only if $\mu \in \mathrm{wt}(W_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathrm{wt}(\omega)))$. ☐

The module $W_{\mathbb{F}}(\omega)$ defined above is called the Weyl module of highest ℓ-weight $\boldsymbol{\omega}$.

2.3. Evaluation modules

For a $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{g})$-module V and $a \in \mathbb{F}^{\times}$, denote by $V(a)$ the pullback of V by ev_a (cf. Section 1.7). The $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{g})$-modules constructed in this manner are referred to as evaluation modules. If $V = V_{\mathbb{F}}(\lambda)$ for some $\lambda \in P^{+}$, we shall denote the corresponding evaluation module by $V_{\mathbb{F}}(\lambda, a)$. It is not difficult to check using (1.13) that, if v is a weight vector of weight λ, then

$$\mathrm{ev}_a(\Lambda_i^{+}(u))\, v = (\omega_{i,a}(u))^{\lambda(h_i)}\, v. \tag{2.1}$$

In particular,

$$V_{\mathbb{F}}(\lambda, a) \cong V_{\mathbb{F}}(\omega_{\lambda,a}). \tag{2.2}$$

Proposition 2.4. Let $\omega = \prod_{j=1}^{n} \omega_{\lambda_j,a_j} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}^{+}$ with $a_i \neq a_j$ for $i \neq j$. Then, $V_{\mathbb{F}}(\omega) \cong \bigotimes_{j=1}^{n} V_{\mathbb{F}}(\lambda_j, a_j)$. ☐

3. Finite-dimensional $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})$-modules

In this section we start the study of finite-dimensional $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})$-modules. In particular, we develop the corresponding highest-ℓ-weight theory, define the Weyl modules in terms of generators and relations, show that they have the same universal property as their non-twisted counterparts, and establish the classification of the irreducible modules. In particular, we recover the related results from [4] in the case that $\mathbb{F}$ has characteristic zero. The proofs are all based on their non-twisted analogues found in [14], but several extra details are needed.

3.1. Highest-ℓ-weight modules

Recall from Section 1.1 that P_0 is the dominant weight lattice of $\mathfrak{g}_0$. Let P_0^{σ} be the subset of P_0 defined as follows:

$$P_0^{\sigma} = \begin{cases} \mu \in P_0 \text{ such that } \mu(h_{i,0}) \in \mathbb{Z}, & \text{if } \mathfrak{g} \text{ is of type } A_{2n} \text{ and } \alpha_i \in R_s \\ P_0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Set $P_0^{\sigma,+} = P_0^{\sigma} \cap P_0^{+}$. We shall also regard each $\mu \in P_0^{\sigma}$ as an element of P by setting

$$\mu(h_i) = \begin{cases} \mu(h_{i,0}), & \text{if } i \in o(I_0), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

We denote by $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\sigma,+}$ the multiplicative monoid consisting of all families of the form $\boldsymbol{\omega} = (\boldsymbol{\omega}_i)_{i\in I_0}$ where each $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i$ is a polynomial in $\mathbb{F}[u]$ with constant term 1. We also denote by $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\sigma}$ the multiplicative group associated to $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\sigma,+}$ which will be referred to as the ℓ-weight lattice associated to the pair $(\mathfrak{g},\sigma)$. For $i \in I_0$, $a \in \mathbb{F}^\times$, and $\mu \in P_0^\sigma$, define the element $\boldsymbol{\omega}_{\mu,a}^\sigma$ in $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\sigma}$ whose i-th entry is

$$(\boldsymbol{\omega}_{\mu,a}^\sigma)_i(u) = \begin{cases} (1-au)^{\mu(h_{i,0})}, & \text{if either } \mathfrak{g} \text{ is of type } A_{2n}, \text{ or if } \mathfrak{g} \text{ is not of type } A_{2n} \text{ and } \alpha_i \in R_s,\\ (1-a^m u)^{\mu(h_{i,0})}, & \text{if } \mathfrak{g} \text{ is not of type } A_{2n} \text{ and } \alpha_i \in R_l. \end{cases} \tag{3.2}$$

As in the non-twisted case, we simplify notation and write $\boldsymbol{\omega}_{i,a}^\sigma$ in place of $\boldsymbol{\omega}_{\omega_i,a}^\sigma$ and refer to it as a fundamental ℓ-weight. Notice that $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\sigma}$ is the free abelian group on the set of fundamental ℓ-weights. Indeed, the map $\mathbb{F} \to \mathbb{F}$ given by $a \mapsto a^k$ for $k = 1,2,3$ is surjective since $\mathbb{F}$ is algebraically closed and, hence, a perfect field.

Let $\mathrm{wt} : \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\sigma} \to P_0^\sigma$ be the unique group homomorphism such that

$$\mathrm{wt}(\boldsymbol{\omega}_{i,a}^\sigma) = \begin{cases} 2\omega_i, & \text{if } \mathfrak{g} \text{ is of type } A_{2n} \text{ and } \alpha_i \in R_s,\\ \omega_i, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{3.3}$$

As in the non-twisted setting, let $\boldsymbol{\omega} \mapsto \boldsymbol{\omega}^-$ be the unique group automorphism of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\sigma}$ mapping $\boldsymbol{\omega}_{i,a}^\sigma$ to $\boldsymbol{\omega}_{i,a^{-1}}^\sigma$ for all $i \in I, a \in \mathbb{F}^\times$. As before, for notational convenience, we set $\boldsymbol{\omega}^+ = \boldsymbol{\omega}$. Also, the abelian group $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\sigma}$ can be identified with a subgroup of the monoid of $|I_0|$-tuples of formal power series with coefficients in $\mathbb{F}$ as before. We then define an inclusion $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\sigma} \hookrightarrow U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}^\sigma)^*$ by setting

$$\boldsymbol{\omega}\left(\binom{h_{i,0}}{k}\right) = \binom{\mathrm{wt}(\boldsymbol{\omega})(h_{i,0})}{k}, \quad \boldsymbol{\omega}(\Lambda_{i,r}^{\sigma,\pm}) = \omega_{i,r} \quad \text{for all} \quad i \in I_0, r,k \in \mathbb{Z}, k \geq 0,$$

$$\text{and}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\omega}(xy) = \boldsymbol{\omega}(x)\boldsymbol{\omega}(y) \quad \text{for all} \quad x,y \in U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}^\sigma),$$

where $\omega_{i,\pm r}$ is the coefficient of u^r in the i-th formal power series of $\boldsymbol{\omega}^\pm$.

Given a $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma)$-module V and $\xi \in U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}^\sigma)^*$, let

$$V_\xi = \{v \in V : \text{ for all } x \in U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}^\sigma), \text{ there exists } k > 0 \text{ such that } (x - \xi(x))^k v = 0\}.$$

We say that V is an ℓ-weight module if

$$V = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\omega} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\sigma}} V_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}.$$

In that case, it follows that

$$V_\mu = \bigoplus_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\omega}\in\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\sigma}:\\ \mathrm{wt}(\boldsymbol{\omega})=\mu}} V_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \quad \text{for all} \quad \mu \in P_0 \quad \text{and} \quad V = \bigoplus_{\mu \in P_0} V_\mu.$$

Moreover, by (1.10), we have that

$$(x_{\mu,-r}^{\pm} \otimes t^r)^{(k)} V_\mu \subseteq V_{\mu \pm k\mu} \quad \text{for all} \quad x_{\mu,-r}^{\pm} \in C^\sigma(O), k \in \mathbb{Z}_+.$$

A nonzero element of $V_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$ is said to be an ℓ-weight vector of ℓ-weight $\boldsymbol{\omega}$. An ℓ-weight vector v is said to be a highest-ℓ-weight vector if $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}^\sigma)v = \mathbb{F}v$ and $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma)^0 v = 0$. If V is generated by a highest-ℓ-weight vector of ℓ-weight $\boldsymbol{\omega}$, V is said to be a highest-ℓ-weight module of highest ℓ-weight $\boldsymbol{\omega}$. Standard arguments show that:

Proposition 3.1. Every highest-ℓ-weight module has a unique proper maximal submodule and, hence, a unique irreducible quotient. ☐

We shall denote by $V_{\mathbb{F}}(\omega)$ the irreducible quotient of a highest-ℓ-weight module of highest ℓ-weight $\omega \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\sigma}$.

The next proposition, which is the "twisted version" of [14, Proposition 3.1], establishes a set of relations satisfied by all finite-dimensional highest-ℓ-weight modules.

Proposition 3.2. Let V be a finite-dimensional $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})$-module, $\lambda \in P_0^+$, and $v \in V_\lambda$ such that $U_{\mathbb{F}}((\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^+)^{\sigma})^0$ $v = 0$ and $\Lambda_{i,r}^{\sigma} v = \omega_{i,r} v$, for all $i \in I_0, r \in \mathbb{Z}$, and some $\omega_{i,r} \in \mathbb{F}$. Then:

(a) $\lambda \in P_0^{\sigma,+}$;

(b) $(x_{\mu,0}^- \otimes t^{ms})^{(k)} v = 0$ for all $x_{\mu,0}^- \in C^{\sigma}(O), k > d_\mu \lambda(h_{\mu,0})$, where $d_\mu = 2$ if $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type A_{2n} and $\mu \in R_s$ and $d_\mu = 1$ otherwise;

(c) $\Lambda_{i,\pm r}^{\sigma} v = 0$ for all $i \in I_0, r > \lambda(h_{i,0})$;

(d) $\omega_{i,\pm\lambda(h_i)} \neq 0$.

Moreover, for all $\lambda \in P_0^{\sigma,+}$, there exist polynomials $f_{i,r} \in \mathbb{F}[t_0, t_1, \cdots, t_{\lambda(h_{i,0})}], i \in I_0, r = 1, \cdots, \lambda(h_{i,0})$, such that for all V and v as above, we have $\omega_{i,-r} v = f_{i,r}(\omega_{i,\lambda(h_{i,0})}^{-1}, \omega_{i,1}, \cdots, \omega_{i,\lambda(h_{i,0})}) v$.

Proof. Part (a) is immediate when $\mathfrak{g}$ is not of type A_{2n}. If $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type A_{2n}, given $\mu \in R_s$, the subalgebra $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{2\mu,1})$ of $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})$ generated by $\{\binom{h_{\mu,0}}{k}, (x_{2\mu,1}^{\pm} \otimes t^{\mp 1})^{(k)} : k \geq 0\}$ is isomorphic to $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ by Lemma 1.1(b). Hence, $\lambda(h_{\mu,0}) \in \mathbb{Z}$.

For part (b), observe that Lemma 1.1 implies that, if $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\mu \in \mathrm{wt}(\mathfrak{g}_{\pm r}) \cap Q_0^+ \setminus \{0\}$, the elements $(x_{\mu,\pm r}^{\pm} \otimes t^{\pm r})^{(k)}$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, generate a subalgebra $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\mu,r})$ of $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})$ isomorphic to $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$. Hence, the equality $(x_{\mu,0}^- \otimes t^{ms})^{(k)} v = 0$ in each case follows from the fact that v generates a finite-dimensional highest-weight module for this subalgebra, which is then isomorphic to a quotient of the Weyl module $W_{\mathbb{F}}(d_\mu \lambda(h_{\mu,0}))$.

Further, if either $\mathfrak{g}$ is not of type A_{2n} and $\alpha_i \in R_s$, or $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type A_{2n} and $\alpha_i \in R_l$, we conclude that $\Lambda_{i,\pm r}^{\sigma} v = 0$ for $r > |\lambda(h_{i,0})|$ by setting $\alpha = \alpha_i, s = 0, l = k = r$ in Lemma 1.9(a). Similarly, application of Lemma 1.9(b) proves the claim for $\mathfrak{g}$ not of type A_{2n} and $\alpha_i \in R_l$. For the case that $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type A_{2n} and $\alpha_i \in R_s$, we conclude that $\Lambda_{i,\pm r}^{\sigma} v = 0$ for $r > |\lambda(h_{i,0})|$ by using part (i) of Lemma 1.9(c) with $\alpha = \alpha_i, s = a = 0, k = r$, along with the already used observation that $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{2\mu,1})$ is isomorphic to $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$. This completes the proof of (c).

We now prove (d). Let $W = U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma}) v$ which is a finite-dimensional $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{g}_0)$-module having λ as its highest-weight. Hence, $\mathrm{wt}(W) = \mathrm{wt}(W_{\mathbb{F}}(\lambda))$ and Theorem 2.1(e) then implies that

$$\lambda - (\lambda(h_{i,0}) + k)\alpha_i \notin \mathrm{wt}(W) \quad \text{for any} \quad k > 0. \tag{3.4}$$

We now split the proof in cases according with the conditions given by each item of the Lemma 1.9. Suppose first that either $\mathfrak{g}$ is not of type A_{2n} and $\alpha_i \in R_s$, or $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type A_{2n} and $\alpha_i \in R_l$. By considering the subalgebra $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\alpha_i,0}) \cong U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$, we conclude that $(x_{i,0}^- \otimes 1)^{(\lambda(h_{i,0}))} v \neq 0$. It follows from (3.4) that $(x_{i,-1}^- \otimes t)^{(k)} (x_{i,0}^- \otimes 1)^{(\lambda(h_{i,0}))} v = 0$ for all $k > 0$. Therefore, $(x_{i,0}^- \otimes 1)^{(\lambda(h_{i,0}))} v$ generates a lowest-weight finite-dimensional representation of $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\alpha_i,1}) \cong U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$. This implies that $0 \neq (x_{i,-1}^+ \otimes t)^{(\lambda(h_{i,0}))} (x_{i,0}^- \otimes 1)^{(\lambda(h_{i,0}))} v = \Lambda_{i,\pm\lambda(h_{i,0})}^{\sigma} v$, where the last equality follows from Lemma 1.9(a). Assume now that $\mathfrak{g}$ is not of type A_{2n} and $\alpha_i \in R_l$. Proceeding similarly we conclude that $(x_{i,0}^- \otimes 1)^{(\lambda(h_{i,0}))} v \neq 0$ and generates a lowest-weight finite-dimensional representation of $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\alpha_i,m})$. The conclusion now follows from Lemma 1.9(b) in a similar fashion. Finally, let $\mathfrak{g}$ be of type A_{2n} and $\alpha_i \in R_s$. It now follows that $(x_{2\alpha_i,1}^- \otimes t)^{(\lambda(h_{i,0}))} v \neq 0$ generates a lowest-weight finite-dimensional representation of $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\alpha_i,0})$. A similar application of part (i) of Lemma 1.9(c) completes the proof.

The proof of the last statement is also split in cases fitting the conditions of Lemma 1.9. Assume first that either $\mathfrak{g}$ is not of type A_{2n} and $\alpha_i \in R_s$, or $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type A_{2n} and $\alpha_i \in R_l$. In this case, setting $\alpha = \alpha_i, s = 0, l = \lambda(h_{i,0})$ and $k = l + r$ in Lemma 1.9 (a), we get for all $r \geq 1$ that

$$0 = (x^+_{i,0} \otimes 1)^{(l)}(x^-_{i,-1} \otimes t)^{(k)}v = \omega_{i,l}(x^-_{i,-1} \otimes t)^{(r)}v + \sum_{j=1}^{l} \omega_{i,l-j}Y_jv = 0, \tag{3.5}$$

where $\omega_{i,0} = 1$ and Y_j is a $\mathbb{Z}$-linear combination of elements of the form

$$(x^-_{i,-1} \otimes t)^{(k_1)} \cdots (x^-_{i,-(r+1)} \otimes t^{r+1})^{(k_{r+1})}$$

with $\sum_n k_n = r$ and $\sum_n nk_n = r+j$, which does not depend neither on V nor on v. Now, since $-r < r+j-2r$, it is not difficult to see that $(x^+_{i,2} \otimes t^{-2})^{(r)}Y_j \in U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma)U_{\mathbb{F}}((\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^+)^\sigma)^0 + H_{r,j}$, where $H_{r,j}$ is a linear combination of monomials of the form $\Lambda^\sigma_{i,r_1} \cdots \Lambda^\sigma_{i,r_m}$ such that $-r < r_j$. Moreover, using Lemma 1.9(a) once more, we get

$$(x^+_{i,2} \otimes t^{-2})^{(r)}(x^-_{i,-1} \otimes t)^{(r)} = (-1)^r\Lambda^\sigma_{i,-r} + U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^+)^0.$$

Hence, plugging this into (3.5), it follows that

$$0 = (x^+_{i,2} \otimes t^{-2})^{(r)}\left(\omega_{i,l}(x^-_{i,-1} \otimes t)^{(r)}v + \sum_{j=1}^{l} \omega_{i,l-j}Y_jv\right) = (-1)^r\omega_{i,-r}\omega_{i,l}v + \sum_{j=1}^{l} \omega_{i,l-j}H_{r,j}v$$

which implies that

$$\omega_{i,-r}\omega_{i,l}v = (-1)^r \sum_{j=1}^{r} \omega_{i,l-j}H_{r,j}v. \tag{3.6}$$

Now, since $H_{r,j}$ involves only the elements Λ_{i,s_j} with $s_j > -r$, a simple induction on r completes the proof in this case. Similarly, when $\mathfrak{g}$ is not of type A_{2n} and $\alpha_i \in R_l$, we repeat this argument using Lemma 1.9(b). Finally, if $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type A_{2n} and $\alpha_i \in R_s$, setting $\alpha = \alpha_i$ and $k = \lambda(h_{i,0})$ on part (ii) of Lemma 1.9(c), we get for all $r \geq 1$ that

$$0 = (x^-_{\alpha_i,0} \otimes 1)^{(2k)}(x^-_{2\alpha_i,1} \otimes t)^{(k+r)}v = \left(\omega_{i,k}(x^-_{2\alpha_i,1} \otimes t)^{(r)} + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \omega_{i,k-j}X_j\right)v \tag{3.7}$$

where $\omega_{i,0} = 1$ and X_j is a $\mathbb{Z}$-linear combination of elements of the form

$$(x^-_{\alpha_i,1} \otimes t)^{(s_1)} \cdots (x^-_{\alpha_i,-k} \otimes t^k)^{(s_k)}(x^-_{2\alpha_i,1} \otimes t)^{(s'_1)} \cdots (x^-_{2\alpha_i,-k} \otimes t^k)^{(s'_k)}$$

with $s'_i < r$, $\sum_m s_m + 2\sum_n s'_n = 2r$ and $\sum_m ms'_m + \sum_n ns_n = r + j$, which does not depend neither on V nor on v. Proceeding as above, since $-r < r + j - 2r$, we first conclude that

$$(x^+_{\alpha_i,1} \otimes t^{-1})^{(2r)}X_j \in U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma)U_{\mathbb{F}}((\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^+)^\sigma)^0 + H_{r,j}$$

where $H_{r,j}$ is a linear combination of monomials of the form $\Lambda^\sigma_{i,r_1} \cdots \Lambda^\sigma_{i,r_m}$ with $-r < r_j$. Then, we get from part (i) of Lemma 1.9(c) that

$$(x^+_{\alpha_i,1} \otimes t^{-1})^{(2r)}(x^-_{2\alpha_i,1} \otimes t)^{(r)} = -\Lambda^\sigma_{i,-r} + U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^+)^0.$$

Hence, plugging this into (3.7), we get

$$0 = (x^+_{\alpha_i,1} \otimes t^{-1})^{(2r)}\left(\omega_{i,k}(x^-_{2\alpha_i,1} \otimes t)^{(r)}v + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \omega_{i,k-j}X_jv\right) = -\omega_{i,-r}\omega_{i,k}v + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \omega_{i,k-j}H_{r,j}v$$

and the proof ends by induction on r as it was done following (3.6). ☐

As in the non-twisted case, given v as in the above proposition, we want to prove that

$$(3.8)\qquad \Lambda^{\sigma}_{i,\lambda(h_{i,0})}\Lambda^{\sigma}_{i,-k}v = \Lambda^{\sigma}_{i,\lambda(h_{i,0})-k}v \qquad \text{for all} \qquad i \in I_0,\ 0 \le k \le \lambda(h_{i,0}).$$

In other words, given v, λ, $i \in I_0$, and $\omega_{i,r}$ as in the proposition and setting

$$\omega_i(u) = 1 + \sum_{r=1}^{\lambda(h_{i,0})} \omega_{i,r}u^r,$$

we want to show that

$$(3.9)\qquad \Lambda^{\sigma,-}_i(u)v = \omega^-_i(u)v.$$

The element $\omega := (\omega_i)_{i\in I_0}$ is called the Drinfeld polynomial of the highest ℓ-weight module generated by v. As observed in [14], the differential equations techniques used in [6, 4] for proving (3.8) do not work in positive characteristic. Thus, in light of the last statement of the Proposition 3.2, it suffices to exhibit for each $\omega \in \mathcal{P}^{\sigma,+}_{\mathbb{F}}$ one finite-dimensional highest-ℓ-weight module with highest-ℓ-weight ω on which (3.9) is satisfied. This will be done in the next section.

3.2. *Evaluation modules*

If V is a finite-dimensional irreducible $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})$-module, then V is generated by a vector v satisfying

$$U_{\mathbb{F}}((\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^+)^{\sigma})^0v = 0, \qquad \binom{h_{i,0}}{k}v = \binom{\lambda(h_{i,0})}{k}v, \qquad \Lambda^{\sigma}_{i,r}v = \omega_{i,r}v,$$

for all $i \in I_0, k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and some $\lambda \in P^{\sigma,+}_0$, $\omega_{i,r} \in \mathbb{F}$. In fact, since V is finite-dimensional, there exists a maximal weight $\lambda \in P^+_0$ such that $V_\lambda \neq 0$. Moreover, as $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}^{\sigma})$ is commutative, we conclude that $\Lambda^{\sigma}_{i,r}V_\lambda \subseteq V_\lambda$ for all $r \in \mathbb{Z}, i \in I_0$. It follows that there exist $v \in V_\lambda$ satisfying $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}^{\sigma})v = \mathbb{F}v$. Hence, by Proposition 3.2(a), we have that $\lambda \in P^{\sigma,+}_0$ and the $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})$-submodule generated by v must coincide with V by the irreducibility of V. In particular, we have the following immediate consequence of Proposition 3.2.

Proposition 3.3. Every finite-dimensional irreducible $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})$-module is a highest-$\ell$-weight module whose highest ℓ-weight lies in $\mathcal{P}^{\sigma,+}_{\mathbb{F}}$. ☐

For a $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{g})$-module V, let $V(a)$ be the pull-back of V by ev^{σ}_a (cf. Section 1.7). In the cases $V = V_{\mathbb{F}}(\lambda)$ and $V = W_{\mathbb{F}}(\lambda)$, we shall denote the evaluation representation by $V_{\mathbb{F}}(\lambda, a)$ and by $W_{\mathbb{F}}(\lambda, a)$, respectively.

Proposition 3.4. Let $\lambda \in P^{\sigma,+}_0$ and regard it as an element of P^+ as in (3.1). Then, given $a \in \mathbb{F}^\times$ and a highest-weight $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{g})$-module V of highest-weight λ, $V(a)$ is a highest ℓ-weight $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})$-module with Drinfeld polynomial $\omega^{\sigma}_{\lambda,a} \in \mathcal{P}^{\sigma,+}_{\mathbb{F}}$. Moreover, the action of $\Lambda^{\sigma,-}_i(u)$ on the highest ℓ-weight vector is given by (3.9) for all $i \in I_0$.

Proof. Let v be a highest-weight vector of V. Suppose first that $o(i)$ is not fixed by σ. Then, by (1.14),

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda^{\sigma,\pm}_i(u)\, v &= \left(\sum_{r=0}^{\infty}(-a)^{\pm r}\sum_{\substack{r_0,\cdots,r_{m-1}\in\mathbb{Z}_+\\ r_0+\cdots+r_{m-1}=r}}\prod_{j=0}^{m-1}\zeta^{-jr_j}\binom{h_{\sigma^j(\alpha_{o(i)})}}{r_j}u^r\right) v = \left(\sum_{r=0}^{\infty}(-a)^{\pm r}\binom{\lambda(h_{\alpha_{o(i)}})}{r}u^r\right) v\\ &= (1-a^{\pm1}u)^{\lambda(h_{\alpha_{o(i)}})}\, v,\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows since $\lambda(h_{\sigma^j(\alpha_{o(i)})}) = 0$ for $0 < j \leq m-1$. Similarly, if $o(i)$ is fixed by σ, then, again by (1.14), we have

$$\Lambda_i^{\sigma,\pm}(u)\, v = \left(\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} (-a^m)^{\pm r} \binom{h_{\alpha_{o(i)}}}{r} u^r \right) v = \left(\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} (-a^m)^{\pm r} \binom{\lambda(h_{\alpha_{o(i)}})}{r} u^r \right) v = (1 - a^{\pm m} u)^{\lambda(h_{\alpha_{o(i)}})}\, v.$$

□

Now we can conclude the proof of (3.9). Given $\omega \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\sigma,+}$, we can write

$$\omega = \prod_{k=1}^{\ell} \prod_{\epsilon=0}^{m-1} \omega^{\sigma}_{\lambda_{k,\epsilon}, \zeta^{m-\epsilon} a_k}, \text{ with } \lambda_{k,\epsilon} \in P_0^+ \text{ and } a_k \in \mathbb{F}^\times \text{ such that } a_i^m \neq a_j^m \text{ for } i \neq j. \tag{3.10}$$

Any such expression is called a standard decomposition of ω. Let $T_{\mathbb{F}}(\omega)$ be the submodule of

$$\bigotimes_{k=1}^{\ell} \bigotimes_{\epsilon=0}^{m-1} V_{\mathbb{F}}(\omega^{\sigma}_{\lambda_{k,\epsilon}, \zeta^{\epsilon} a_k})$$

generated by the tensor product of the highest weight vectors. Then, $T_{\mathbb{F}}(\omega)$ is a nonzero finite-dimensional highest ℓ-weight module and it follows from (1.8) and Proposition 3.4 that its highest ℓ-weight is ω. This completes the proof of (3.9).

Theorem 3.5. The isomorphism classes of finite-dimensional simple $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma)$-modules is in bijection with $\mathcal{P}^{\sigma,+}$.

Proof. By Proposition 3.3, to each isomorphism class of finite-dimensional simple $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma)$-modules we have associated an element of $\mathcal{P}^{\sigma,+}$. Thus, it remains to see that this map is surjective. Indeed, given $\omega \in \mathcal{P}^{\sigma,+}$, the module $T_{\mathbb{F}}(\omega)$ constructed above is a finite-dimensional highest-ℓ-module of highest ℓ-weight ω. Hence, it has a simple quotient by Proposition 3.1. □

We shall denote by $V_{\mathbb{F}}(\omega)$ any simple finite-dimensional simple $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma)$-module with highest ℓ-weight ω.

3.3. *The Weyl modules*

We now establish the existence of universal finite-dimensional highest ℓ-weight $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma)$-modules.

Definition 3.6. Given $\omega \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\sigma,+}$, let $W_{\mathbb{F}}(\omega)$ be the $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma)$-module generated by a vector v satisfying the defining relations of being a highest-ℓ-weight vector of ℓ-weight ω and

$$(x^-_{\mu,0} \otimes t^{mr})^{(l)} v = 0, \tag{3.11}$$

for all $\mu \in R_0^+, l, r \in \mathbb{Z}, l > \mathrm{wt}(\omega)(h_{\mu,0})$. $W_{\mathbb{F}}(\omega)$ is called the Weyl module of highest ℓ-weight ω.

It follows from the last subsection that $W_{\mathbb{F}}(\omega) \neq 0$ for all $\omega \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\sigma,+}$ (since $V_{\mathbb{F}}(\omega)$ is clearly a nonzero quotient of $W_{\mathbb{F}}(\omega)$). Moreover, Proposition 3.2 implies that every finite-dimensional highest-ℓ-weight module of highest ℓ-weight $\omega \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\sigma,\pm}$ is a quotient of $W_{\mathbb{F}}(\omega)$. Our final goal of this section is to prove that $W_{\mathbb{F}}(\omega)$ is finite-dimensional.

Lemma 3.7. Let $\omega \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\sigma,\pm}$ and $\mu \in P_0$. If $W_{\mathbb{F}}(\omega)_\mu \neq 0$, then $W(\omega)_{w\mu} \neq 0$ for all $w \in \mathcal{W}_0$.

Proof. By standard arguments, it follows from (3.11) that every vector $w \in W_{\mathbb{F}}(\omega)$ belongs to a finite-dimensional $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{g}_0)$-submodule of $W_{\mathbb{F}}(\omega)$. Now all the claims follow from the corresponding results for finite-dimensional $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{g}_0)$-modules. $\square$

Notice that the previous lemma implies that

$$\mathrm{wt}(W_{\mathbb{F}}(\omega)) \subseteq \mathrm{wt}(W_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathrm{wt}(\omega))). \tag{3.12}$$

We are ready to prove the next theorem which implies that the Weyl modules are the universal finite-dimensional highest-ℓ-weight modules.

Theorem 3.8. $W_{\mathbb{F}}(\omega)$ is finite-dimensional for all $\omega \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\sigma,+}$.

Proof. Set $\lambda = \mathrm{wt}(\omega)$ and let v be a highest-ℓ-weight vector generating $W_{\mathbb{F}}(\omega)$. Since (3.12) implies that $\mathrm{wt}(W_{\mathbb{F}}(\omega))$ is finite, it suffices to prove that $W_{\mathbb{F}}(\omega)$ is spanned by the elements

$$(x^-_{\mu_1,-s_1} \otimes t^{s_1})^{(k_1)} \cdots (x^-_{\mu_n,-s_n} \otimes t^{s_n})^{(k_n)} v,$$

with $n, k_j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $s_j \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\mu_j \in \mathrm{wt}(\mathfrak{g}_{-s_j}) \setminus \{0\} \cap Q_0^+$, $0 \le s_j < \lambda(h_{\mu_j,0})$, $j = 1, \dots, n$. Notice that such elements with no restriction on s_j clearly span $W_{\mathbb{F}}(\omega)$.

Let $\mathcal{T} = Q_0^+ \times \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}_+$ and Ξ be the set of functions $\phi : \mathbb{N} \to \mathcal{T}$, $j \mapsto \phi_j = (\mu_j, s_j, k_j)$, such that $k_j = 0$ for all j sufficiently large and $\mu_j \in \mathrm{wt}(\mathfrak{g}_{-s_j}) \setminus \{0\}$ for all j. Let also Ξ' be the subset of Ξ consisting of the elements ϕ such that $0 \le s_j < \lambda(h_{\mu_j,0})$. Given $\phi \in \Xi$ such that $k_j = 0$ for $j > m$, we associate the element

$$v_\phi = (x^-_{\mu_1,-s_1} \otimes t^{s_1})^{(k_1)} \cdots (x^-_{\mu_n,-s_n} \otimes t^{s_n})^{(k_n)} v \in W_{\mathbb{F}}(\omega^\sigma). \tag{3.13}$$

Define the degree of ϕ to be $d(\phi) = \sum_j k_j$ and the maximal exponent of ϕ to be $e(\phi) = \max\{k_j\}$. Clearly $e(\phi) \le d(\phi)$ and $d(\phi) \ne 0$ implies $e(\phi) \ne 0$. Since there is nothing to be proved when $d(\phi) = 0$ we assume from now on that $d(\phi) > 0$. Set

$$\Xi_{d,e} = \{\phi \in \Xi : d(\phi) = d \text{ and } e(\phi) = e\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \Xi_d = \bigcup_{1 \le e \le d} \Xi_{d,e}.$$

We prove by induction on d and sub-induction on e that, if $\phi \in \Xi_{d,e}$ is such that there exists j with $s_j < 0$ or $s_j \ge \lambda(h_{\mu_j,0})$, then v_ϕ is in the span of vectors associated to elements in Ξ'. More precisely, given $0 < e \le d \in \mathbb{N}$, we assume, by induction hypothesis, that this statement is true for every ϕ which belongs either to $\Xi_{d,e'}$ with $e' < e$ or to $\Xi_{d'}$ with $d' < d$. The proof is split in two cases according to whether $e = d$ or $e < d$.

When $e = d$, it follows that $v_\phi = (x^-_{\mu,-s} \otimes t^s)^{(e)} v$ for some μ and s. Suppose first that $e = 1$. We split the proof in cases fitting the conditions of Lemma 1.9. If either $\mathfrak{g}$ is not of type A_{2n} and $\mu \in R_s$, or if $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type A_{2n} and $\mu \in R_l$, setting $l = \lambda(h_{\mu,0})$ and $k = l + 1$ on Lemma 1.9(a), we get

$$\Big((X^-_{\mu;r,\pm}(u))\Lambda^{\sigma,\pm}_{\mu}(u)\Big)_{\lambda(h_{\mu,0})+1} v = 0 \qquad \text{for all} \qquad r \in \mathbb{Z}$$

or, equivalently,

$$(x^-_{\mu,-(r+1)} \otimes t^{r+1}\Lambda^{\sigma}_{\mu,\pm l} + x^-_{\mu,-(r+2)} \otimes t^{r+2}\Lambda^{\sigma}_{\mu,\pm(l-1)} + \cdots + x^-_{\mu,-(r+l+1)} \otimes t^{r+l+1})v = 0 \tag{3.14}$$

for all $r \in \mathbb{Z}$. Now, we consider the cases $s \ge l$ and $s < 0$ separately and proceed with a further induction on s and $|s|$, respectively. If $s \ge l$, this is easily done by taking $r = s - l - 1$ in (3.14). Observing that $\Lambda^\sigma_{\mu,\pm l} v \neq 0$ (Lemma 3.2(c)), the case $s < 0$ is dealt with by taking $r = s - 1$ in (3.14). Proceeding similarly, if $\mathfrak{g}$ is not of type A_{2n} and $\mu_i \in R_l$, we repeat this argument using Lemma 1.9(b), and, if $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type A_{2n} and $\mu \in R_s$ or $\mu \in 2R_s$, the conclusion follows from parts (i) and (iii) of Lemma 1.9(c). We omit the details. This concludes the case $e = 1$. Suppose now that $e > 1$. If either $\mathfrak{g}$ is not of type A_{2n} and $\mu \in R_s$, or if $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type A_{2n} and $\mu \in R_l$, setting $l = e\lambda(h_{\mu,0})$ and $k = l + e$ in Lemma 1.9(a) we obtain

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\lambda(h_{\mu,0})} (x^-_{\mu,-(r+j+1)} \otimes t^{r+j+1})^{(e)} \Lambda_{\mu,l-ej} v + \begin{array}{c}\text{other terms in the span of vectors}\\ v_{\phi'} \text{ with } \phi' \in \Xi_{e,e'} \text{ for } e' < e\end{array} = 0 \tag{3.15}$$

for all $r \in \mathbb{Z}$. As before, we consider the cases $s \geq \lambda(h_{\mu,0})$ and $s < 0$ separately and prove the statement by a further induction on s and $|s|$, respectively. If $s \geq \lambda(h_{\mu,0})$, set $r = s - 1 - \lambda(h_{\mu,0})$ in (3.15) and notice that, for $1 \leq j \leq \lambda(h_{\mu,0})$, we have $0 < r + j + 1 \leq s$, from the induction easily follows. For $s < 0$, observe that $\Lambda_{\mu,l-e\lambda(h_{\mu,0})} v = v \neq 0$ and, therefore,

$$\{j \in \mathbb{Z}_+ : j \leq \lambda(h_{\mu,0}) \text{ and } \Lambda_{\mu,l-ej} v \neq 0\} \neq \emptyset.$$

Let j_0 be the minimum of this set. Then, (3.15) can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{j=j_0}^{\lambda(h_{\mu,0})} (x^-_{\mu,-(r+j+1)} \otimes t^{r+j+1})^{(e)} \Lambda_{\mu,l-ej} v + \begin{array}{c}\text{other terms in the span of vectors}\\ v_{\phi'} \text{ with } \phi' \in \Xi_{e,e'} \text{ for } e' < e\end{array} = 0. \tag{3.16}$$

Since $\omega_{\mu,l-ej_0} \neq 0$ by definition of j_0, the induction on $|s|$ is easily done by using (3.16) with $r = s - 1 - j_0$. By using Lemma 1.9(b) and part (iii) of Lemma 1.9(c), respectively, the cases $\mathfrak{g}$ is not of type A_{2n} and $\mu \in R_l$, and $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type A_{2n} and $\mu \in 2R_s$ can be carried out similarly. It remains to consider the case $\mathfrak{g}$ of type A_{2n} and $\mu \in R_s$. This time we set $r = e$, $k = \lambda(h_{\mu,0})$, $s = r$ and $\alpha = \mu$ on part (iv) of Lemma 1.9(c) to get

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\lambda(h_{\mu,0})+1} (x^-_{\mu,-(r+j-1)} \otimes t^{r+j-1})^{(e)} \Lambda_{\mu,ek+e-ej} v + \begin{array}{c}\text{other terms in the span of vectors}\\ v_{\phi'} \text{ with } \phi' \in \Xi_{e,e'} \text{ for } e' < e\end{array} = 0 \tag{3.17}$$

for all $r \in \mathbb{Z}$. Again, we proceed by induction on s and $|s|$ separately working with (3.17) similarly to the way we worked with (3.15). This completes the case $e = d$.

If $e < d$, we can assume by inductions hypothesis on d, that $0 \leq s_j < \lambda(h_{\mu_j,0})$ for $j > 1$ in (3.13). Hence, an application of Lemma 1.10 completes the argument. ☐

4. Twisted modules via restriction of the action

We shall use the following notation and assumptions throughout the section. We assume that m is not the characteristic of $\mathbb{F}$. Given a $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$-module V, we denote by V^σ the module for $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma)$ obtained by restriction of the action. We also let $\mathbb{K}$ be the fraction field of $\mathbb{A}$ (hence, $\mathbb{K}$ has characteristic zero). The image of $a \in \mathbb{A}$ in $\mathbb{F}$ will be denoted by $\overline{a}$.

4.1. *Statement of the main theorem*

The goal of this section is to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 4.1. Let $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathcal{P}^{\sigma,+}_{\mathbb{F}}$. Then, there exists $\boldsymbol{\omega} \in \mathcal{P}^+_{\mathbb{F}}$ such that

$$V_{\mathbb{F}}(\boldsymbol{\omega})^\sigma \cong V_{\mathbb{F}}(\boldsymbol{\pi}) \qquad \text{and} \qquad W_{\mathbb{F}}(\boldsymbol{\omega})^\sigma \cong W_{\mathbb{F}}(\boldsymbol{\pi}).$$

Remark 4.2. In characteristic zero, Theorem 4.1 was proved in [4]. Although our proof is parallel to the one from [4], part of the arguments used there, such as the explicit description of certain annihilating ideals, could not be replicated in positive characteristic. The technical differences are mostly concentrated in the results proved in Subsection 4.2 where the hypothesis that m is not the characteristic of $\mathbb{F}$ is used. However, in the case of Weyl modules our alternate approach to annihilating ideals is not sufficient for proving the result intrinsically. Instead, we use the result in the characteristic zero setting and then use the technique of reduction modulo p.

Before going into the technical details of the proof, let us construct the element $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ of the statement of Theorem 4.1. Let

$$\boldsymbol{\pi} = \prod_{k=1}^{\ell} \prod_{\epsilon=0}^{m-1} \boldsymbol{\omega}^{\sigma}_{\lambda_{k,\epsilon},\zeta^{m-\epsilon}a_k}$$

be a standard decomposition of $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ (see (3.10)). By decomposing $\lambda_{k,\epsilon}$ as sum of fundamental weights (see (3.2)), it follows that

$$\boldsymbol{\pi} = \begin{cases} \prod_{k=1}^{\ell} \prod_{\epsilon=0}^{m-1} \prod_{i\in I_0} (\boldsymbol{\omega}^{\sigma}_{\omega_i,\zeta^{m-\epsilon}a_k})^{e_{k,\epsilon,i}}, & \text{if } \mathfrak{g} \text{ is not of type } A_{2n}, \\ \prod_{k=1}^{\ell} \prod_{\epsilon=0}^{m-1} \prod_{i\in I_0} (\boldsymbol{\omega}^{\sigma}_{2^{\delta i,j}\omega_i,\zeta^{m-\epsilon}a_k})^{e_{k,\epsilon,i}}, & \text{if } \mathfrak{g} \text{ is of type } A_{2n}, \end{cases}$$

for some $e_{k,\epsilon,i}$ and where j in the second line is the unique index in I_0 such that $\alpha_j \in R_s$. Then,

$$\boldsymbol{\omega} = \prod_{k=1}^{\ell} \boldsymbol{\omega}_{\mu_k,a_k} \qquad \text{with} \qquad \mu_k = \sum_{\epsilon=0}^{m-1} \sum_{i\in I_0} e_{k,\epsilon,i}\sigma^{\epsilon}(\omega_{o(i)}). \tag{4.1}$$

4.2. *On certain surjective homomorphisms*

Given a polynomial $g(u) = \prod_{j=1}^{n}(1 - a_j u) \in \mathbb{K}[u]$, let

$$\tilde{g}(t) = \prod_{j=1}^{n}(t - a_j) \in \mathbb{K}[t]. \tag{4.2}$$

For $\alpha \in R^+, k \in \mathbb{Z}$, define

$$x^{\pm}_{\alpha,k,g} = x^{\pm}_{\alpha} \otimes t^k \tilde{g}(t).$$

Notice that, if $a_j \in \mathbb{A}$ for all j, then $(x^{\pm}_{\alpha,k,g})^{(r)} \in U_{\mathbb{A}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ for all $r, k \in \mathbb{Z}, r \geq 0$. Moreover, one can easily check that the image $1 \otimes (x^{\pm}_{\alpha,k,g})^{(r)}$ of $(x^{\pm}_{\alpha,k,g})^{(r)}$ in $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ is nonzero. The next lemma is trivially established.

Lemma 4.3. Let $g(u) = \prod_{j=1}^{n}(1 - a_j u)$, $f(u) = \prod_{j=1}^{n}(1 - b_j u) \in \mathbb{K}[u]$. Suppose that $a_j, b_j \in \mathbb{A}^{\times}$ and $\overline{a_j} = \overline{b_j}$ for all j. Then, $1 \otimes (x^{\pm}_{\alpha,k,g})^{(r)} = 1 \otimes (x^{\pm}_{\alpha,k,f})^{(r)}$. □

We can then define elements $(x^{\pm}_{\alpha,k,f})^{(r)} \in U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ for any polynomial $f(u) = \prod_{j=1}^{n}(1 - b_j u) \in \mathbb{F}[u]$ by setting

$$(x^{\pm}_{\alpha,k,f})^{(r)} = 1 \otimes (x^{\pm}_{\alpha,k,g})^{(r)} \tag{4.3}$$

where g is any polynomial of the form $g(u) = \prod_{j=1}^{n}(1 - a_j u)$ with $a_j \in \mathbb{A}^{\times}$ such that $\overline{a_j} = b_j$ for all j.

Given such $f \in \mathbb{F}[u]$, consider the ideal $I^f_{\mathbb{F}}$ of $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ generated by $\{(x^{\pm}_{\alpha,k,f})^{(r)} : \alpha \in R^+, r, k \in \mathbb{Z}, r > 0\}$ and set

$$U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})_f = \frac{U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})}{I^f_{\mathbb{F}}}.$$

Notice that $I_{\mathbb{F}}^{f}$ is a Hopf ideal of $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ and, hence, the Hopf algebra structure on $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ naturally induces one on $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})_f$. Moreover, if V, W are $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$-modules such that $I_{\mathbb{F}}^{f}V = I_{\mathbb{F}}^{f}W = 0$, then $V \otimes W$ is naturally a module for $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})_f$.

Let ϕ_f be the composition $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma}) \hookrightarrow U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}) \to U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})_f$ where the last map is the canonical projection. The goal of this subsection is to prove the following proposition.

Proposition 4.4. Let $f(u) = \prod_{j=1}^{n}(1 - b_j u) \in \mathbb{F}[u]$ and suppose that $b_i^m \neq b_j^m$ for all $i \neq j$. Then, for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$, the map ϕ_{f^N} is surjective.

The following corollary is then easily deduced.

Corollary 4.5. Let V be a $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$-module such that $I_{\mathbb{F}}^{f^N}V = 0$ for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and suppose $S \subseteq V$ is such that $V = U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})S$. Then, $V = U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})S$ and, if V is a simple $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$-module, V^{σ} is a simple $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})$-module. $\square$

Fix g as in (4.3) and $N \in \mathbb{N}$, consider the ideal $I_{\mathbb{A}}^{g^N}$ of $U_{\mathbb{A}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ defined similarly, and let $U_{\mathbb{A}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})_{g^N} = \frac{U_{\mathbb{A}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})}{I_{\mathbb{A}}^{g^N}}$. Notice also that the image of $I_{\mathbb{A}}^{g^N}$ in $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ is contained in $I_{\mathbb{F}}^{f^N}$ and, hence, we have an $\mathbb{A}$-linear epimorphism

$$U_{\mathbb{A}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})_{g^N} \to U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})_{f^N}.$$

Moreover, the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{tikzcd}
U_{\mathbb{A}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma}) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & U_{\mathbb{A}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & U_{\mathbb{A}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})_{g^N} \arrow[d] \\
U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma}) \arrow[r] & U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}) \arrow[r] & U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})_{f^N}
\end{tikzcd}$$

Hence, in order to prove Proposition 4.4, it suffices to prove that the composition ϕ_{g^N} of the maps in the first row of the above diagram is surjective. Notice that the hypothesis $b_i^m \neq b_j^m$ for all $i \neq j$, together with the fact that $\mathbb{A}$ is a DVR with $\mathbb{F}$ as its residue field, implies that

$$a_i^m - a_j^m \in \mathbb{A}^{\times} \qquad \text{for all} \qquad i \neq j. \tag{4.4}$$

Let $\overline{x}$ denote the image of $x \in U_{\mathbb{A}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ in $U_{\mathbb{A}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})_{g^N}$. Thus, we want to prove that $\overline{(x_{\alpha}^{\pm} \otimes t^k)^{(r)}}$ belongs to the image of ϕ_{g^N} for all $\alpha \in R^+, r, k \in \mathbb{Z}, r \geq 1$. Henceforth we fix $\alpha \in R^+$. By (1.1) we have

$$(x_{\alpha}^{\pm} \otimes t^k)^{(r)} = \left(\frac{1}{\Gamma_{\alpha}} \sum_{\epsilon=0}^{m-1} x_{\alpha,\epsilon}^{\pm} \otimes t^k \right)^{(r)}.$$

Since m is not the characteristic of $\mathbb{F}$ and $\mathbb{A}$ is a DVR with $\mathbb{F}$ as residue field, we have $\Gamma_{\alpha} \in \mathbb{A}^{\times}$. If $\alpha + \sigma(\alpha) \notin R$, then $[x_{\alpha,\epsilon}^{\pm} \otimes t^k, x_{\sigma(\alpha),\epsilon}^{\pm} \otimes t^k] = 0$ and it follows from (1.4) that it suffices to show that $\overline{(x_{\alpha,\epsilon}^{\pm} \otimes t^k)^{(r)}}$ belongs to the image of ϕ_{g^N} for all $0 \leq \epsilon < m$, $r \geq 1$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. If $\alpha + \sigma(\alpha) \in R$, notice that the subalgebra of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ generated by $\{x_{\alpha,0}^{\pm} \otimes t^k, x_{\alpha,1}^{\pm} \otimes t^k, x_{\alpha+\sigma(\alpha),1}^{\pm} \otimes t^{2k}\}$ (with a fixed choice of $\pm$) is a Heisenberg subalgebra. Then, (1.12) implies that it suffices to show that $\overline{(x_{\alpha,\epsilon}^{\pm} \otimes t^k)^{(r)}}$ and $\overline{(x_{\alpha+\sigma(\alpha),1}^{\pm} \otimes t^k)^{(r)}}$ belong to the image of ϕ_{g^N} for all $0 \leq \epsilon < m$, $r \geq 1$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. This will follow from (4.8) and (4.9) below.

We claim that, given $\epsilon = 0, \ldots, m-1$, and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, there exists $\Psi_k^{\epsilon} \in t^{m-\epsilon}\mathbb{A}[t^m, t^{-m}]$ such that $\Psi_k^{\epsilon} - t^k$ is divisible by $\tilde{g}^N$ in $\mathbb{A}[t, t^{-1}]$ (where $\tilde{g}$ is given by (4.2)). Assuming this claim, we complete the proof as follows. Write $\Psi_k^\epsilon - t^k = \sum_{i=-n_1}^{n_2} e_i t^i \tilde{g}^N$ for some $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $e_i \in \mathbb{A}, -n_1 \leq i \leq n_2$. Then, another application of (1.4) shows that

$$(x_\beta^\pm \otimes (\Psi_k^\epsilon - t^k))^{(r)} \in I_{\mathbb{A}}^{g^N} \quad \text{for all} \quad \beta \in R^+, r \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{4.5}$$

It then follows from (1.1), (4.5), and either (1.4) (if $\beta + \sigma(\beta) \notin R$) or (1.12) applied to the Heisenberg subalgebras spanned by $\{x_\beta^\pm \otimes (\Psi_k^\epsilon - t^k), x_{\sigma(\beta)}^\pm \otimes (\Psi_k^\epsilon - t^k), x_{\beta+\sigma(\beta),1}^\pm \otimes (\Psi_k^\epsilon - t^k)^2\}$ (if $\beta + \sigma(\beta) \in R$) that

$$(x_{\beta,\epsilon}^\pm \otimes (\Psi_k^\epsilon - t^k))^{(r)} \in I_{\mathbb{A}}^{g^N} \quad \text{for all} \quad \beta \in R^+, r \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Using this, we now show that

$$\overline{(x_{\alpha,\epsilon}^\pm \otimes t^k)^{(r)}} = \overline{(x_{\alpha,\epsilon}^\pm \otimes \Psi_k^\epsilon)^{(r)}} \quad \text{for all} \quad 0 \leq \epsilon < m,\ r, k \in \mathbb{Z}, r > 0, \tag{4.6}$$

and, if $\alpha + \sigma(\alpha) \in R$, that

$$\overline{(x_{\alpha+\sigma(\alpha),1}^\pm \otimes t^k)^{(r)}} = \overline{(x_{\alpha+\sigma(\alpha),1}^\pm \otimes \Psi_k^1)^{(r)}} \quad \text{for all} \quad r, k \in \mathbb{Z}, r > 0. \tag{4.7}$$

Indeed, since $x_{\alpha,\epsilon}^\pm \otimes t^k$ and $x_{\alpha,\epsilon}^\pm \otimes (t^k - \Psi_k^\epsilon)$ commute, we get from (1.4) that

$$(x_{\alpha,\epsilon}^\pm \otimes \Psi_k^\epsilon)^{(r)} = (x_{\alpha,\epsilon}^\pm \otimes (t^k - (t^k - \Psi_k^\epsilon)))^{(r)} = \sum_{j=0}^{r} (-1)^j (x_{\alpha,\epsilon}^\pm \otimes t^k)^{(r-j)} (x_{\alpha,\epsilon}^\pm \otimes (t^k - \Psi_k^\epsilon))^{(j)}.$$

Since the only summand with nonzero image in $U_{\mathbb{A}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})_{g^N}$ is the one with $j = 0$, (4.6) follows. Equation (4.7) is proved similarly using that $x_{\alpha+\sigma(\alpha),1}^\pm \otimes t^k$ and $x_{\alpha+\sigma(\alpha),1}^\pm \otimes (t^k - \Psi_k^1)$ commute.

Finally, let $\mu \in \operatorname{wt}(\mathfrak{g}_\epsilon) \cap Q_0^+$ such that $\mu = \alpha|_{\mathfrak{h}_0}$. If $\alpha \in O$, then $x_{\alpha,\epsilon}^\pm = x_{\mu,\epsilon}^\pm$ by (1.3). Otherwise, we have $\sigma^j(\alpha) \in O$ for some $j = 0, \cdots, m-1$, and, hence, $x_{\alpha,\epsilon}^\pm = \zeta^{j\epsilon} x_{\sigma^j(\alpha),\epsilon}^\pm = \zeta^{j\epsilon} x_{\mu,\epsilon}^\pm$ by (1.1) (recall that $\zeta \in \mathbb{A}^\times$). Since $(x_{\mu,\epsilon}^\pm \otimes \Psi_k^\epsilon)^{(r)} \in U_{\mathbb{A}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma)$, it follows from (4.6) that

$$\overline{(x_{\alpha,\epsilon}^\pm \otimes t^k)^{(r)}} = \phi_{g^N} \left(c_\alpha^r (x_{\mu,\epsilon}^\pm \otimes \Psi_k^\epsilon)^{(r)} \right) \tag{4.8}$$

with $c_\alpha = 1$ if $\alpha \in O$ and $c_\alpha = \zeta^{j\epsilon}$ if $\sigma^j(\alpha) \in O$ for some $j \neq 0$. Similarly, if $\alpha + \sigma(\alpha) \in R^+$, then $(x_{2\mu,1}^\pm \otimes \Psi_k^1)^{(r)} \in U_{\mathbb{A}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\sigma)$ and (4.7) implies that

$$\overline{(x_{\alpha+\sigma(\alpha),1}^\pm \otimes t^k)^{(r)}} = \phi_{g^N} \left((x_{2\mu,1}^\pm \otimes \Psi_k^1)^{(r)} \right). \tag{4.9}$$

It remains to prove the existence of Ψ_k^ϵ as claimed. Let $\langle \tilde{g}^N \rangle$ be the ideal of $\mathbb{A}[t, t^{-1}]$ generated by $\tilde{g}^N$. It suffices to show that the map

$$\varphi : \mathbb{A}[t^m, t^{-m}] \to \mathbb{A}[t, t^{-1}]/\langle \tilde{g}^N \rangle \quad \text{given by} \quad t^k \mapsto \overline{t^k} \quad \text{for all} \quad k \in m\mathbb{Z}$$

is surjective. Indeed, using this fact, let φ_k^ϵ be any element in $\varphi^{-1}(t^{k-m+\epsilon})$ and set $\Psi_k^\epsilon(t) = t^{m-\epsilon} \varphi_k^\epsilon(t)$ which clearly has the claimed properties.

To prove that φ is surjective, observe that, since $a_i^m \neq a_j^m$ for $i \neq j$, the Chinese Remainder Theorem implies that we have an isomorphism

$$\mathbb{A}[t, t^{-1}]/\langle \tilde{g}^N \rangle \simeq \prod_i \mathbb{A}[t, t^{-1}]/\langle (t - a_i)^N \rangle \tag{4.10}$$

and an epimorphism

$$\mathbb{A}[t^m,t^{-m}] \to \prod_i \mathbb{A}[t^m,t^{-m}]/\langle (t^m-a_i^m)^N\rangle. \tag{4.11}$$

Evidently, for every $a\in\mathbb{A}^\times$, we also have isomorphisms

$$\mathbb{A}[t^m,t^{-m}]/\langle (t^m-a^m)^N\rangle \simeq \mathbb{A}[t^m]/\langle (t^m-a^m)^N\rangle \quad\text{and}\quad \mathbb{A}[t,t^{-1}]/\langle (t-a)^N\rangle \simeq \mathbb{A}[t]/\langle (t-a)^N\rangle. \tag{4.12}$$

Note that $(t^m-a^m)^N\in\langle (t-a)^N\rangle$. Indeed, recalling that $m\in\{2,3\}$, we have

$$t^m-a^m=(t-a)\left(ma^{m-1}+(t-a)(t+2a)^{\delta_{m,3}}\right). \tag{4.13}$$

Hence, the surjectivity of φ follows from (4.10), (4.11), and (4.12) if we prove that

$$\psi:\mathbb{A}[t^m]\to\mathbb{A}[t]/\langle (t-a)^N\rangle \quad\text{given by}\quad t^{mk}\mapsto\overline{t^{mk}}\quad\text{for all}\quad k\in\mathbb{N}$$

is surjective for all $a\in\mathbb{A}^\times$. In order to prove that ψ is surjective, let

$$\mathfrak{m}=(t-a)\mathbb{B}\qquad\text{where}\qquad \mathbb{B}:=\mathbb{A}[t]/\langle (t-a)^N\rangle.$$

Using that $t(t-a)=a(t-a)+(t-a)^2$, one easily sees by induction on $n\geq 1$ that

$$t^n(t-a)\in(t-a)\mathbb{A}+(t-a)^2\mathbb{A}[t]\quad\text{for all}\quad n\geq 1. \tag{4.14}$$

As $t-a=\frac{(t^m-a^m)}{ma^{m-1}}-\frac{(t-a)^2}{ma^{m-1}}(t+2a)^{\delta_{m,3}}$ by (4.13) and recalling that $m,a\in\mathbb{A}^\times$, (4.14) implies that

$$\mathfrak{m}\subseteq\overline{(t^m-a^m)}\mathbb{A}+\mathfrak{m}^2. \tag{4.15}$$

Using this and that $t^m-a^m\in(t-a)\mathbb{A}[t]$, one easily proves by induction on $n\geq 1$ that

$$\mathfrak{m}^n\subseteq\overline{(t^m-a^m)^n}\mathbb{A}+\mathfrak{m}^{n+1}\quad\text{for all}\quad n\geq 1. \tag{4.16}$$

Plugging (4.16) back in (4.15) and proceeding recursively, it follows that

$$\mathfrak{m}\subseteq\sum_{i=1}^n\overline{(t^m-a^m)^i}\mathbb{A}+\mathfrak{m}^{n+1}\quad\text{for all}\quad n\geq 1. \tag{4.17}$$

Taking $n=N-1$ above and observing that $\overline{(t^m-a^m)^i}\mathbb{A}\in\operatorname{Im}\psi$, it follows that $\mathfrak{m}\subseteq\operatorname{Im}\psi$. On the other hand, since $\mathbb{A}\subseteq\operatorname{Im}\psi$ and $\mathbb{B}=\mathbb{A}+\mathfrak{m}$, we conclude that ψ is surjective as desired.

4.3. *Proof of Theorem 4.1 for simple modules*

Given $\omega=\prod_{j=1}^n\omega_{\lambda_j,a_j}\in\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}^+$ with $a_i\neq a_j$ for $i\neq j$, set

$$f_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}(u)=\prod_{j=1}^n(1-a_ju)\qquad\text{and}\qquad I_{\mathbb{F}}^{\boldsymbol{\omega}}=I_{\mathbb{F}}^{f_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}}. \tag{4.18}$$

Lemma 4.6. $I_{\mathbb{F}}^{\boldsymbol{\omega}}V_{\mathbb{F}}(\omega)=0.$

Proof. To shorten notation, set $f = f_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$. Assume first that $\boldsymbol{\omega} = \boldsymbol{\omega}_{\lambda,a}$ for some $\lambda \in P^+$ and $a \in \mathbb{F}^\times$. In particular, $V_{\mathbb{F}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) \cong V_{\mathbb{F}}(\lambda, a)$. Then, it is immediate from the definition of the evaluation map that, if $g \in \mathbb{F}[u]$ is a multiple of f and has constant term 1, then

$$(x^{\pm}_{\alpha,k,g})^{(r)} V_{\mathbb{F}}(\lambda, a) = (a^k \tilde{g}(a))^r (x^{\pm}_{\alpha})^{(r)} V_{\mathbb{F}}(\lambda, a) = 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad \alpha \in R^+, k, r \in \mathbb{Z}, r > 0, \tag{4.19}$$

since $\tilde{g}(a) = 0$.

For general $\boldsymbol{\omega} \in \mathcal{P}^+_{\mathbb{F}}$, say $\boldsymbol{\omega} = \prod_{j=1}^n \boldsymbol{\omega}_{\lambda_j,a_j}$ with $a_i \neq a_j$ for $i \neq j$, we have $V_{\mathbb{F}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) \cong \bigotimes_{i=1}^{n} V_{\mathbb{F}}(\lambda_j, a_j)$ by Proposition 2.4. Then, given $v = v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_n$ with $v_j \in V_{\mathbb{F}}(\lambda_j, a_j)$, it follows from (4.19) and (1.7) with $x = x_{\alpha,k,f}$ that

$$(x_{\alpha,k,f})^{(r)} v = 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad \alpha \in R^+, k, r \in \mathbb{Z}, r > 0,$$

which implies $I^{\boldsymbol{\omega}}_{\mathbb{F}} V_{\mathbb{F}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = 0$. ☐

We are ready to prove Theorem 4.1 in the case of simple modules. Recall the definition of $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ in (4.1) and that $a_i^m \neq a_j^m$ for $i \neq j$ by (3.10). It then follows from Lemma 4.6 and Corollary 4.5 that $V_{\mathbb{F}}(\boldsymbol{\omega})^\sigma$ is simple. Evidently, if v is a highest-ℓ-weight vector of $V_{\mathbb{F}}(\boldsymbol{\omega})$, then $U_{\mathbb{F}}((\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^+)^\sigma)^0 v = 0$. Hence, it remains to prove that

$$\Lambda_i^{\sigma,+}(u)\, v = \boldsymbol{\pi}_i(u)\, v \quad \text{for all} \quad i \in I_0.$$

Suppose first that $o(i)$ is not fixed by σ. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda_i^{\sigma,+}(u) v &= \prod_{j=0}^{m-1} \Lambda_{\sigma^j(o(i))}(\zeta^{m-j} u) v = \prod_{j=0}^{m-1} \boldsymbol{\omega}_{\sigma^j(o(i))}(\zeta^{m-j} u) v \\
&= \prod_{k=1}^{\ell} \prod_{j=0}^{m-1} (\boldsymbol{\omega}_{\sigma^j(o(i)),\zeta^{m-j} a_k})_{\sigma^j(o(i))}^{\mu_k(h_{\sigma^j(o(i))})} v \\
&\overset{*}{=} \prod_{k=1}^{\ell} \prod_{j=0}^{m-1} (1 - \zeta^{m-j} a_k)^{e_{k,j,i}} v = \boldsymbol{\pi}_i(u) v,
\end{aligned}$$

where equality $*$ follows from the definition of μ_k in (4.1) and the last equality follows from (3.2). Similarly, if $o(i)$ is fixed by σ, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda_i^{\sigma,+}(u)\, v = \Lambda^+_{o(i);m}(u)\, v &= \prod_{k=1}^{\ell} (1 - a_k^m u)^{\mu_k(h(o(i)))} \\
&= \prod_{k=1}^{\ell} \prod_{\epsilon=0}^{m-1} (1 - a_k^m u)^{e_{k,\epsilon,i}} v \\
&= \prod_{k=1}^{\ell} \prod_{\epsilon=0}^{m-1} (1 - (\zeta^{m-\epsilon} a_k)^m u)^{e_{k,\epsilon,i}} v = \boldsymbol{\pi}_i(u) v,
\end{aligned}$$

since $(\zeta^{m-\epsilon})^m = 1$ for all $0 \leq \epsilon < m-1$ and the last equality once again follows from (3.2). ☐

The next result is immediate from Proposition 2.4 and the above proof of Theorem 4.1 and recovers the classical result that the simple modules are tensor products of evaluation modules.

Corollary 4.7. $V_{\mathbb{F}}(\boldsymbol{\pi})$ is isomorphic to $\bigotimes_{k=1}^{\ell} V_{\mathbb{F}}(\mu_k, a_k)^\sigma$. ☐

Remark 4.8. Combining the last corollary with [14, Theorem 3.4], one gets a version of Steinberg's tensor product theorem for twisted hyper loop algebras.

4.4. Proof of Theorem 4.1 for Weyl modules

Let $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\times}$ be the subset of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{K}}^{+}$ consisting of I-tuples of polynomials whose roots lie in $\mathbb{A}^{\times}$. Similarly, define the subset $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\sigma,\times}$ of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\sigma,+}$.

Theorem 4.9. Let $\boldsymbol{\varpi} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\times}$ (respectively, $\boldsymbol{\varpi} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\sigma,\times}$), v a highest-ℓ-weight vector of $W_{\mathbb{K}}(\boldsymbol{\varpi})$, and $L(\boldsymbol{\varpi}) = U_{\mathbb{A}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})v$ (respectively, $L(\boldsymbol{\varpi}) = U_{\mathbb{A}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})v$). Then, L is a free $\mathbb{A}$-module and the canonical map $\mathbb{K} \otimes_{\mathbb{A}} L(\boldsymbol{\varpi}) \to W_{\mathbb{K}}(\boldsymbol{\varpi})$ is an isomorphism.

Proof. The non-twisted statement was proved in [14, Theorem 4.5(b)] and the twisted version is proved similarly by repeating the steps of the proof of Theorem 3.8 (cf. proof of [14, Theorem 4.2]). ☐

Let $L(\boldsymbol{\varpi})$ be as in the last theorem and set

$$L_{\mathbb{F}}(\boldsymbol{\varpi}) = \mathbb{F} \otimes_{\mathbb{A}} L(\boldsymbol{\varpi}).$$

Then, $L_{\mathbb{F}}(\boldsymbol{\varpi})$ is a $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$-module (respectively, a $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})$-module) which is clearly a quotient of $W_{\mathbb{F}}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ where $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ is the image of $\boldsymbol{\varpi}$ in $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}^{+}$ (respectively, in $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\sigma,+}$).

Conjecture 4.10. $L_{\mathbb{F}}(\boldsymbol{\varpi}) \cong W_{\mathbb{F}}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$. In particular, $\dim W_{\mathbb{F}}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \dim W_{\mathbb{K}}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ for any $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{K}}^{+}$ (respectively, $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\sigma,+}$) such that $\mathrm{wt}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \mathrm{wt}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$.

Remark 4.11. In the non-twisted case, the above conjecture was formulated in [14]. It can be regarded as an analogue of a conjecture of Chari and Pressley [6] saying that all Weyl modules for $U_{\mathbb{C}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ can be obtained as classical limits of appropriate Weyl modules for quantum affine algebras. Chari-Pressley's conjecture has been proved in [5] (if $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type A), in [10] (for simply laced $\mathfrak{g}$), and in [25] (in general). A different approach has been pointed out by Nakajima using the global basis theory developed in [1, 19, 20, 23, 24] ([25] also uses global basis results, but in a different manner). Nakajima's argument, which is outlined in the introduction of [10], most likely can be used to give a proof of Conjecture 4.10 as well (including the twisted version). See also [3] for an approach for proving Conjecture 4.10 along the lines of [10, 25].

Recall the definition of $f_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$ from (4.18) and, given $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$I_{\mathbb{F}}^{\boldsymbol{\omega},N} = I_{\mathbb{F}}^{f_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}^{N}}.$$

Similarly, define $I_{\mathbb{K}}^{\boldsymbol{\varpi},N}$ for $\boldsymbol{\varpi} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{K}}^{+}$ and $I_{\mathbb{A}}^{\boldsymbol{\varpi},N}$ for $\boldsymbol{\varpi} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\times}$. The following is the analogue of Proposition 4.4 for Weyl modules.

Lemma 4.12. For all $\boldsymbol{\omega} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}^{+}$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}$ such that $I_{\mathbb{F}}^{\boldsymbol{\omega},N} W_{\mathbb{F}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = 0$.

Proof. Let $\boldsymbol{\varpi} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\times}$ be such that its image in $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}^{+}$ is $\boldsymbol{\omega}$. It follows from [4, Proposition 2.7] that there exists $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}$ such that $I_{\mathbb{K}}^{\boldsymbol{\varpi},N} W_{\mathbb{K}}(\boldsymbol{\varpi}) = 0$. Hence, $I_{\mathbb{A}}^{\boldsymbol{\varpi},N} L(\boldsymbol{\varpi}) = 0$ which implies $\overline{I_{\mathbb{A}}^{\boldsymbol{\varpi},N}} L_{\mathbb{F}}(\boldsymbol{\varpi}) = 0$ where $\overline{I_{\mathbb{A}}^{\boldsymbol{\varpi},N}}$ is the image of $I_{\mathbb{A}}^{\boldsymbol{\varpi},N}$ in $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$. Since $I_{\mathbb{F}}^{\boldsymbol{\omega},N}$ is clearly contained in $\overline{I_{\mathbb{A}}^{\boldsymbol{\varpi},N}}$, it follows that $I_{\mathbb{F}}^{\boldsymbol{\omega},N} L_{\mathbb{F}}(\boldsymbol{\varpi}) = 0$ and the lemma follows from Conjecture 4.10. ☐

We are ready to prove Theorem 4.1 in the case of Weyl modules. Let $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ be as in (4.1), N as in Lemma 4.12, and fix a highest-ℓ-weight vector v for $W_{\mathbb{F}}(\boldsymbol{\omega})$. The same computation closing the proof of Theorem 4.1 for simple modules shows that $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})v$ is a quotient of $W_{\mathbb{F}}(\boldsymbol{\pi})$. Moreover, it follows from Lemma 4.12 and Corollary 4.5 that

$$W_{\mathbb{F}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})v.$$

On the other hand, let $\boldsymbol{\varpi} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\sigma,\times}$ be such that its image in $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\sigma,+}$ is $\boldsymbol{\pi}$. Then, by the twisted part of Conjecture 4.10, $\dim W_{\mathbb{F}}(\boldsymbol{\pi}) = \dim W_{\mathbb{K}}(\boldsymbol{\varpi})$. By the characteristic zero version of Theorem 4.1 proved in [4], we have $\dim W_{\mathbb{K}}(\boldsymbol{\varpi}) = \dim W_{\mathbb{K}}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ for some $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{K}}^{+}$ such that $\mathrm{wt}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \mathrm{wt}(\boldsymbol{\omega})$ (in fact, it is easy to see that $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\times}$ and that its image in $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}^{+}$ is $\boldsymbol{\omega}$). Another application of the non-twisted part of Conjecture 4.10 completes the proof. $\square$

Remark 4.13. Using Theorem 4.1, one can show by the same arguments used in characteristic zero (see [29]) that the blocks of the category of finite-dimensional $U_{\mathbb{F}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\sigma})$-modules are described as in the characteristic zero setting.

References

[1] J. Beck and H. Nakajima, *Crystal bases and two-sided cells of quantum affine algebras*, Duke Math. J. **123** (2004), 335–402.

[2] A. Bianchi, Representações de hiperálgebras de laços e álgebras de multicorrentes, Ph.D. Thesis, Unicamp (2012).

[3] A. Bianchi, A. Moura, and T. Macedo, *On Demazure and local Weyl modules for affine hyperalgebras*, work in progress.

[4] V. Chari, G. Fourier, and P. Senesi, *Weyl Modules for the twisted loop algebras*, J. Algebra **319** (2008), no. 12, 5016–5038.

[5] V. Chari and S. Loktev, *Weyl, Demazure and fusion modules for the current algebra of* $\mathfrak{sl}_{r+1}$, Adv. in Math., **207** (2006), no. 2, 928–960.

[6] V. Chari and A. Pressley, *Weyl modules for classical and quantum affine algebras*, Represent. Theory **5** (2001), 191–223.

[7] I. Efrat, Valuation, Orderings, and Milnor K-Theory, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs AMS **124** (2006).

[8] G. Fourier, T. Khandai, D. Kus, and A. Savage, *Local Weyl modules for equivariant map algebras with free abelian group actions*, J. Algebra **350** (2012), 386–404, DOI:10.1016/j.jalgebra.2011.10.018.

[9] G. Fourier and D. Kus, *Demazure modules and Weyl modules: The twisted current case*, to appear in Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., arXiv:1108.5960.

[10] G. Fourier and P. Littelmann, *Weyl modules, Demazure modules, KR-modules, crystals, fusion products and limit constructions*, Adv. in Math. **211** (2007), no. 2, 566–593.

[11] G. Fourier, N. Manning, and P. Senesi, *Global Weyl modules for the twisted loop algebra*, arXiv:1110.2752.

[12] H. Garland, *The arithmetic theory of loop algebras*, J. Algebra **53** (1978), 480–551.

[13] J. E. Humphreys, *Introduction to Lie algebras and representation theory*, Springer–Verlag, GTM **9** (1970).

[14] D. Jakelic and A. Moura, *Finite-dimensional representations of hyper loop algebras*, Pacific J. Math. **233** (2007), no. 2, 371 - 402.

[15] D. Jakelic and A. Moura, *Finite-dimensional representations of hyper loop algebras over non-algebraically closed fields*, Algebras and Representation Theory **13** (2010), no. 3, 271–301.

[16] D. Jakelic and A. Moura, *On multiplicity problems for finite-dimensional representations of hyper loop algebras*, Contemp. Math. **483** (2009), 147–159.

[17] J. Jantzen, *Representations of algebraic groups*, Academic Press (1987).

[18] V. Kac, *Infinite dimensional Lie algebras*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 1990.

[19] M. Kashiwara, *Crystal bases of modified quantized enveloping algebras*, Duke Math. J. **73** (1994), 383–413.

[20] M. Kashiwara, *On level zero representations of quantized affine algebras*, Duke Math. J. **112** (2002), 117–195.

[21] B. Kostant, *Groups over* $\mathbb{Z}$, Algebraic Groups and Discontinuous Subgroups, Proc. Symp. Pure Math. IX, Providence, AMS (1966).

[22] D. Mitzman, *Integral Bases for Affine Lie Algebras and Their Universal Enveloping Algebras*, Contemp. Math. **40** (1983).

[23] H. Nakajima, *Quiver varieties and finite-dimensional representations of quantum affine algebras*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **14** (2001), 145–238.

[24] H. Nakajima, *Extremal weight modules of quantum affine algebras*, Adv. Stud. Pure Math. **40** (2004), 343–369.

[25] K. Naoi, *Weyl modules, Demazure modules and finite crystals for non-simply laced type*, Adv. in Math. **229** (2012), no. 2, 875–934.

[26] E. Neher and A. Savage, *Extensions and block decompositions for finite-dimensional representations of equivariant map algebras*, arXiv:1103.4367.

[27] E. Neher, A. Savage, and P. Senesi, *Irreducible finite-dimensional representations of equivariant map algebras*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **364** (2012), no. 5, 2619–2646, DOI: 10.1090/S0002-9947-2011-05420-6.

[28] S. Prevost. *Vertex Algebras and Integral Bases for the Enveloping Algebras of Affine Lie Algebras*, Mem. Math. Amer. Soc. **466** (1992).

[29] P. Senesi, *The block decomposition of finite-dimensional representations of twisted loop algebras*, Pacific J. Math. **244** (2010), no. 2, 355–357.

[30] J.-P Serre, *Local Fields*, Springer-Verlag GTM **67** (1980).